

MARINE PROTECTED AREAS  
FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE MEETING

OMNI MARINA HOTEL  
700 North Shoreline Boulevard  
Corpus Christi, Texas

Monday, April 24, 2006  
8:40 a.m.

APPEARANCES:

LAUREN WENZEL, Designated Federal Official

MARINE PROTECTED AREAS FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. Tundi Agardy - Sound Seas  
Mr. Charles Beeker - Indiana University  
Mr. Robert Bendick - The Nature Conservancy  
Mr. David Benton - Commercial Fishing (Not Present)  
Dr. Daniel Bromley - University of Wisconsin  
Dr. Anthony Chatwin - The Nature Conservancy  
Dr. Michael Cruickshank - Marine Minerals Technology  
Center Associates  
Dr. Eric Gilman - Blue Ocean Institute  
Ms. Ellen Goethel - Fishing and ocean education  
Dr. John Halsey - Michigan Department of State  
Dr. Dennis Heinemann - The Ocean Conservancy  
Dr. Mark Hixon - Oregon State University  
Mr. George Lapointe - Maine Department of Marine  
Resources  
Dr. Bonnie McCay - Rutgers University  
Dr. Steven Murray - California State University,  
Fullerton  
Dr. John Ogden - Florida Institute of Oceanography,  
University of South Florida  
Terry O'Halloran - tourism industry (Not present)  
Mr. Lelei Peau - American Samoa Department of Commerce

APPEARANCES (CONTINUED):

MARINE PROTECTED AREAS FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
(Continued)

Dr. Walter Pereyra - Arctic Storm Management Group,  
Inc.  
Mr. Max Peterson - International Association of Fish  
and Wildlife Agencies (Retired)  
Dr. James Ray - Oceanic Environmental Solutions, LLC  
Andrew Sansom - (Not Present) Mr. Warren Pewlage  
substituted; Texas State University, San Marcos  
Dr. Daniel Suman - University of Miami  
Ms. Kay Williams - (Not Present) Gulf of Mexico  
Fishery Management Council  
Mr. Jim Woods, Makah Tribe  
Mr. Robert Zales, II - Recreational Fishing

NATIONAL MARINE PROTECTED AREAS CENTER:

Joseph A. Uravitch  
Jonathan Kelsey  
Brian Jordan  
Mr. Charlie Wahle,  
Dana Topousis, Bunny Sparks

FURTHER ATTENDANCE:

Ms. Katherine Andrews - Coastal States Organization  
Ms. Mary Glackin - Department of Commerce Ex-Officio  
Mr. Ralph Lopez, NOAA Fisheries  
Mr. Tony MacDonald - Coastal States Organization  
Mr. Brian Melzian - EPA  
Mr. Jeff Pearson, Mr. Randal Bowman,  
Dr. John W. Tunnell, Jr. - A & M University - Corpus  
Ms. Fran Wilsusan, Northwest Indian Fisheries  
Commission

## C O N T E N T S

	PAGE
8:40 a.m. Call to Order . . . . .	5
Committee Business. . . . .	5
Approval of Minutes of May 2005 meeting . . . . .	7
Review of Agenda. . . . .	8
Introduction of All Members and Guests present. . . . .	11
Election of Chair and Vice Chair . . . . .	18
DOC/DOI Feedback on MPA FAC Recommendations. . . . .	20
Joseph A. Uravitch, National Marine Protected Areas Center	
Update on National System Framework. . . . .	38
Jonathan Kelsey, National Marine Protected Areas Center	
New Charge for MPA FAC . . . . .	87
Mary Glackin, Department of Commerce Ex-Officio	
Priorities for MPA Center's National System Development Work. . . . .	110
Joseph A. Uravitch, National Marine Protected Areas Center	
Chairperson Dr. Daniel Bromley address to Council. . . . .	132
Lunch . . . . .	147
Subcommittees Meet from 1:00 - 3:15 (not reported)	
Break 3:15 p.m.	
State Perspectives on the National System of MPAs. . . . .	148
Katherine Andrews, Coastal States Organization	
No public comment . . . . .	183
Informational Comments by Committee Members . . . . .	183
Adjourned at 4:26 p.m.. . . . .	189

## P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. WENZEL: I'm Lauren Wenzel, Designated Federal Official. I call this meeting to order.

I would like to make a couple of brief announcements before we get started. First, welcome, bowlers.

We figure maybe that is the reason they set the room up like this; but we have asked them to widen things out into our more usual square tomorrow. For today, I know it is a little bit of a challenge to see faces and to identify who is who.

It is also going to be a challenge for our court reporter, so if you could please say your name as you get started, that would really help us make sure that we have the remarks attributed to the right person.

I also wanted to mention that we are trying out these microphones and we have a low ceiling. So, if we get a lot of feedback, we may have to try some different microphones tomorrow. But let's try this today and see how it goes. If it is bad, let us know, if you are having trouble hearing.

1                   Lunch is going to be in the Coastline  
2 Restaurant, which you've gotten a ticket. It's just  
3 right around the corner in this building.

4                   And we are going to be having two Subcommittee  
5 break-outs in this room and one in the other. We can  
6 talk about that when we get to that point in the  
7 Agenda.

8                   So, I just wanted to say that we are going to  
9 be having elections for Chair and Vice Chair shortly  
10 this morning; but for now I would like to turn the  
11 meeting over to our Interim Chair Dan Bromley and our  
12 Vice Chair Bonnie McCay. Thanks.

13                  INTERIM CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you, Lauren.  
14 It's been a long eleven months.

15                  I was struck by the enthusiasm and excitement  
16 that I detected in the room when we came in. People  
17 seem really happy to see each other despite what we  
18 went through and that is nice. I joked with some and  
19 said: "You know, if we met every month, we would  
20 probably be punching each other in the mouth." But 11  
21 months were a wonderful cooling off period -- not that  
22 we needed that.

1           But I do detect a certain level of excitement  
2   to be back. It was awfully frustrating for many of us  
3   that we had to cancel our November meeting that was  
4   going to be here; but here we are and it is wonderful  
5   to have some people with us.

6           Lauren, when will we introduce the people?  
7   Well, I guess the first order -- Lauren is kicking me  
8   under the table here, like my wife.

9           The first order of business is to approve the  
10   Minutes of the previous meeting. Is that right?

11           MS. WENZEL: Yes.

12           INTERIM CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: And the Minutes are  
13   clipped in the packet that we received, the second  
14   clip, I believe, with the green fingerprint.

15           I know you have all had a chance to read them,  
16   so I will entertain a motion to approve them.

17           MR. LaPOINTE: So move.

18           INTERIM CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: So moved.

19           DR. MURRAY: Second.

20           INTERIM CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: And it's been  
21   seconded.

22           George Lapointe moved. The reporter

1 appreciates me doing that. Okay. It was George  
2 Lapointe moving it be approved and Steve Murray  
3 seconded. Did I get that right?

4 (Attendees nodded in agreement.)

5 INTERIM CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Any  
6 discussion of the Minutes?

7 (No audible response.)

8 INTERIM CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: All in favor of  
9 approving the Minutes as it should be, say "aye"

10 (Attendees indicated affirmatively.)

11 INTERIM CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Opposed?

12 (No response.)

13 INTERIM CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: The Agenda in front  
14 of you spells out how we plan to spend the next three  
15 days here. We have some very exciting panels.

16 We also have time for our Subcommittees to get  
17 back into business. They are going to be constituted.  
18 We will talk about that later.

19 I think at this point, do we need -- Let me  
20 put it this way: This afternoon we have a public  
21 comment period. For those of you that are new, we  
22 always have a public comment period on our first day



1 and our last day. Dana, down there, keeps track of  
2 people who have an interest in commenting. We give  
3 them five minutes. And if today we get a small  
4 turnout, we will use that period at the end of today,  
5 starting at 4:00, for a few little additional items of  
6 information for you of interest. But if we don't have  
7 many people who wish to speak, then we will probably  
8 adjourn a bit early.

9 The committee dinner is this evening at 6:30.  
10 We will give some more explanation of that later.

11 On Tuesday, we have some time for  
12 Subcommittees. We will go through all of that.

13 And I think that is about it in terms of the  
14 Agenda. If there are questions, Lauren and I will be  
15 happy to entertain them.

16 Have I skipped anything at this point?

17 (No audible response.)

18 INTERIM CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: So please look at  
19 the Agenda. If you have questions, let us know.

20 Yes, Bob. This is Bob Bendick speaking.

21 MR. BENDICK: I didn't know -- Yes, it is on.

22 It just strikes me that a half hour for

1 Katherine Andrews talking about the perspective of all  
2 the states on the marine protected areas and questions  
3 also might be a little short. So, if there were a way  
4 for us to provide a little more time, I think that  
5 would be helpful to us all.

6 INTERIM CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes. Thank you,  
7 Bob. That is right. We can do that. She starts at  
8 3:30. We have public comment session at 4:00. So, I  
9 agree with you.

10 I believe what we would have to do to be legal  
11 would be at 4:00, if we are still deeply engaged in  
12 this discussion, to suspend it and take our public  
13 comments at 4:00 so the people who made an effort to  
14 get here at 4:00 can do that, and then we can go back  
15 and spend some more time on that subject.

16 Would that be all right, Lauren?

17 (Ms. Wenzel nodded.)

18 INTERIM CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: So that is a nice  
19 idea. Thank you.

20 Other comments on the Agenda?

21 (No response.)

22 INTERIM CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Hearing none, let's

1 go to the introduction of new members and the  
2 introduction of all of us, actually, because we have  
3 enough new people that I think it would be useful to do  
4 that.

5 I would like to start here on my left and go  
6 around. I would like people to give us ever so briefly  
7 who they are and just a bit of what they do, where they  
8 come from.

9 So, let's just go around to everybody, not  
10 just the new ones. Let's just go around.

11 Lauren, you are on the left. Lauren is my  
12 brain. I don't count her as a separate thing. I'm  
13 Lauren Wenzel. I work at the Marine Protected Area  
14 Center. I'm the Designated Federal Official for this  
15 Committee, which means I'm your staff.

16 MR. URAVITCH: I'm Joe Uravitch, National  
17 Director of the National Marine Protected Area Center.  
18 The Center is responsible for the implementation of the  
19 MPA Executive Order 13158 and this Committee is one of  
20 those tasks of the Executive Board.

21 MR. BEEKER: I'm Charles Beeker. I'm with  
22 Indiana University. I work with the recreational dive

1 industry. I'm on the Honorary Board of Governors of  
2 Project AWARE Foundation, specialist in water park  
3 development issues.

4 DR. CRUICKSHANK: Michael Cruickshank. I am  
5 retired from the University of Hawaii. I'm President  
6 of the Marine Minerals Technology Center Associates.

7 MR. BOWMAN: Randy Bowman with the Interior  
8 Department. We just reorganized our involvement in  
9 this group. The Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife  
10 & Parks, Department of the Interior, David P. Smith,  
11 Deputy Assistant Secretary, will be our Ex-Officio  
12 representative here; however, he is not able to travel  
13 right now and I'm here representing him and I will be  
14 the staff person for him on this for the next couple of  
15 days.

16 MR. PEAU: Good morning. My name is Lelei  
17 Peau. I'm the Deputy Director for the Department of  
18 Commerce of American Samoa. I'm responsible for local  
19 coordinations of our coral reef activities as well as  
20 protected areas.

21 DR. HEINEMANN: Good morning. I'm Dennis  
22 Heinemann, one of the new members of the Committee.

1 I'm Senior Scientist with the Ocean Conservancy,  
2 Washington, D.C. I work on advocacy and science issues  
3 associated with MPAs and fisheries.

4 DR. HALSEY: John Halsey. I'm the State  
5 Archaeologist for the State of Michigan. I'm involved  
6 with the marine protected areas. In fact, Michigan has  
7 12 what we call State Preserves devoted entirely to  
8 shipwrecks. I'm also the State Representative of the  
9 Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary.

10 DR. MURRAY: I'm Steve Murray from the  
11 California State University at Fullerton. I'm a  
12 coastal marine ecologist.

13 MR. LaPOINTE: My name is George Lapointe.  
14 I'm the Commissioner of the Marine Resources for the  
15 State of Maine.

16 MS. GOETHEL: I'm one of the new members. My  
17 name is Ellen Goethel. I'm here representing the  
18 fishing industry, New England.

19 DR. AGARDY: Morning. Tundi Agardy. I'm an  
20 independent based in Washington, D.C. -- not  
21 politically independent. I work for myself now. And I  
22 have been labeled an environmentalist, but I'm formerly

1 an ecologist, so --

2 DR. RAY: I'm Jim Ray, Oceanic Environmental  
3 Solutions, formerly Shell Oil Company. Biological  
4 oceanographer is my background.

5 MR. WOODS: I'm Jim Woods with the Makah Tribe  
6 in Washington. I'm the Sustainable Resource  
7 Coordinator for our Fisheries Management, in which I  
8 manage all of our environmental programs, and I'm the  
9 environmental advisor to our Council.

10 MR. WAHLE: Morning. I'm Charlie Wahle with  
11 the MPA Center. I'm an ecologist. I'm the Director of  
12 the MPA Science Institute in California.

13 DR. SUMAN: Good morning. Daniel Suman,  
14 University of Miami, from the Division of Marine  
15 Affairs and Policy.

16 MR. BENDICK: I'm Bob Bendick, Southern  
17 Regional Director of the Nature Conservancy.

18 MR. PEARSON: I am Jeff Pearson. I'm the  
19 Deputy Chief for the Coast Guard Marine Protected  
20 Species Program in Washington, D.C.

21 DR. CHATWIN: I'm Tony Chatwin. I work for  
22 the National Conservancy coordinating marine

1 conservation efforts in South America.

2 MR. GILMAN: I'm Eric Gilman. I'm the  
3 Fisheries Bycatch Program Director for the Blue Ocean  
4 Institute.

5 MS. GLACKIN: I'm Mary Glackin. I'm the  
6 Department of Commerce representative to this Committee  
7 and I'm the Assistant Administrator for Program  
8 Planning and Integration.

9 DR. HIXON: Good morning. I'm Mark Hixon.  
10 I'm a Professor in the Department of Zoology at Oregon  
11 State University and my expertise is the ecology of  
12 coastal marine fishes.

13 DR. PEREYRA: Good morning. I'm Wally  
14 Pereyra. I'm Chairman of the Arctic Storm Management  
15 Group. My background is marine scientist. I was with  
16 NOAA for many years. I was on the North Pacific  
17 Fishery Management Council prior to that.

18 MR. ZALES: Bob Zales, II. I'm the President  
19 of the National Association of Charter Boat Operators.  
20 My family has been in the charter fishing business in  
21 Florida for over 40 years now.

22 MR. MELZIAN: Good morning. I'm Brian

1 Melzian. I represent EPA on this auspicious body.

2 Also, as an oceanographer, I represent the  
3 Administrator of EPA on the National Marine Research  
4 Leadership Council. As some of you know, I represent  
5 EPA as an oceanographer on the Executive Committee  
6 which is now involved in the Ocean Conservancy System  
7 in partnership with NOAA and more than 20 other  
8 agencies.

9 And then, lastly, I've been assigned to work  
10 with the National Waterfall Monitoring Network which is  
11 now being developed by the Administration. Thank you.

12 INTERIM VICE CHAIR McCAY: Hi. I'm Bonnie  
13 McCay. I'm a Professor in the Department of Human  
14 Ecology, Rutgers University in New Jersey, and my  
15 specialty is the anthropology of coastal fishing  
16 communities.

17 INTERIM CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: And I'm Dan  
18 Bromley. I'm an economist at the University of  
19 Wisconsin. My work focuses on living and non-living  
20 natural resources, public policy, institutional  
21 arrangements for governing resources.

22 So, is that it? Oh, I'm sorry. We have some



1 people in the back we must please ask to identify  
2 themselves as well. So, everybody in the back.

3 And, Dana, we skipped you, too. From here, I  
4 can't tell if you are in the back or not, Dana. I'm  
5 sorry.

6 MS. TOPOUSIS: I'm Dana Topousis with the MPA  
7 Center.

8 MR. PEWLAGE: I'm Warren Pewlage. I'm  
9 representing Mr. Andrew Sansom, who was just recently  
10 appointed to the Committee.

11 MR. JORDAN: Brian Jordan, MPA Center,  
12 Cultural Resource Coordinator.

13 MR. KELSEY: Jonathan Kelsey with the Marine  
14 Protected Area Center, National System Development  
15 Coordinator.

16 MS. ANDREWS: I'm Kathy Andrews. I'm with the  
17 Coastal States Organization.

18 MS. WILSUSAN: Fran Wilsusan, Northwest Indian  
19 Fisheries Commission.

20 MR. LOPEZ: Ralph Lopez with NOAA Fisheries.

21 MS. SPARKS: Bunny Sparks, National Marine  
22 Protected Area Center.

1 INTERIM CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. We heard  
2 from everyone. So, thank you very much. It is so nice  
3 to have you here.

4 Did you want to say anything about the dinner  
5 this evening? Should I say that? It says here  
6 "sign-up sheet".

7 MS. WENZEL: We will go ahead and send around  
8 a sign-up sheet for dinner just so we can get a head  
9 count. We are going to go to the Water Street Seafood  
10 Company, which is very nice, lots of selection in  
11 seafood, salads. We went there last night to test it  
12 out for you.

13 So, if you would just let me know if you are  
14 coming. And if you're bringing a guest, let me know.  
15 We need a head count for the dinner, which is at 6:30.  
16 The restaurant is within about three or four blocks of  
17 this location, so it's an easy walk.

18 INTERIM CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Thank you,  
19 Lauren. I believe we are at just about 9:00 o'clock  
20 and that is the election time.

21 MS. WENZEL: Right. So, it is time for us to  
22 elect our Chair and Vice Chair.

1           I hadn't heard from anyone expressing interest  
2   in running for this position except for the incumbents,  
3   but I wanted to take a moment and ask if there were  
4   other folks who were interested in running for these  
5   positions.

6           (No response.)

7           MS. WENZEL: Aside from finger pointing, okay.

8           No one is expressing interest. So, given that  
9   we have an unopposed situation, I would just ask for  
10   unanimous consent for the re-election of the Chair and  
11   Vice Chair. All in favor say "aye".

12          (Attendees responded affirmatively.)

13          MS. WENZEL: All opposed?

14          (No response.)

15          MS. WENZEL: Mr. Chair?

16          CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I have been working in  
17   China a lot lately.

18          (Applause.)

19          CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: This has a certain ring of  
20   familiarity as I watched President Hu Shin Tao work his  
21   way through Washington, D.C.'s "Who is Who".

22          Okay. Thank you. Bonnie and I are delighted.

1 I will speak for her. I think she is delighted.

2 We are happy to try to keep pushing forward  
3 with the important Agenda. And if you want to make an  
4 acceptance speech --

5 VICE CHAIR McCAY: That's okay. I will let  
6 you speak.

7 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: That is all there is of  
8 mine. There is less time than we imagined.

9 Joe, are you ready to do your 9:30  
10 presentation?

11 MR. URAVITCH: Sure.

12 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Joe is going to talk  
13 with us about the feedback that we received from NOAA  
14 and the Interior on our recommendations. And we have  
15 then Jonathan Kelsey will also do an update.

16 So, we are into the 9:30 part of the program.  
17 For those of you who are new to us, we have a tendency  
18 sometimes to move quickly. We try hard to stay on  
19 schedule and we are delighted if we can be ahead of  
20 schedule.

21 So, Joe, it is yours. Thank you.

22 MR. URAVITCH: Thank you. We are going to

1 make sure we are all set up here.

2 I'm going to basically go over the feedback  
3 from the Department of Commerce and the Interior on the  
4 recommendations from the previous committee.

5 You should all have in -- well, there would  
6 have been folders if Fed Ex had not lost it -- in the  
7 pile of paper in front of you the official response  
8 from the Department of Commerce and the Department of  
9 the Interior.

10 And let me just call this up on the screen  
11 here. Problem right off.

12 MR. JORDAN: Oh, it is already off. The  
13 question is: Where is our images? The screen is  
14 blank.

15 MR. URAVITCH: All right. Why don't we take  
16 five minutes while technology does its things.

17 Lauren, the computer has been locked and only  
18 you can open it.

19 MS. WENZEL: I'm right here.

20 MR. URAVITCH: Oh, there you are. How many  
21 government employees does it take to set up a --

22 (Brief pause while adjusting equipment.)

1           MR. URAVITCH: If the folks out here would  
2 like to move their chairs this way, feel free. We are  
3 having some real room limitation problems. All right.  
4 Well, at least it is coming up on the screen.

5           My presentation is going to be followed by  
6 Jonathan Kelsey discussing where we are with the  
7 National System Framework at this point. So, this is  
8 very much interrelated to the activities of the  
9 Committee and its recommendations to the Departments.

10          You all met last in May of 2005 and adopted  
11 your first report, which was officially transmitted in  
12 June of 2005.

13          The Chairman, Dr. Bromley, met with NOAA  
14 Administrator Lautenbacher and then Department of the  
15 Interior Assistant Secretary Rebecca Watson in August  
16 of 2005 to discuss the recommendations of the  
17 Committee.

18          The official response from the Departments was  
19 sent via letter to Dr. Bromley in September, and then  
20 in November with the formal response on the full  
21 report.

22          We just wanted to thank the members of the

1 Advisory Committee who have been involved with us over  
2 the past number of months in public meetings. We have  
3 held a series of public dialogue sessions leading up to  
4 the publication of the Framework of the National System  
5 of MPAs and members of this Committee have been very  
6 helpful in attending these meetings and providing the  
7 views of the Committee and their recommendations to the  
8 public as we have gone through this.

9           We have distributed your report very widely.  
10 It is available and it's front page news still on the  
11 MPA.gov web site for request.

12           We have made distributions to Congressional  
13 Offices, a variety of agencies in the 35 states and  
14 territories, all the federal agencies both through our  
15 federal interagency MPA working group as well as other  
16 contacts. All the fishery management councils have  
17 this information, the tribes as well, environmental  
18 organizations, and it has been available on request.

19           It's been a very popular seller, been a lot of  
20 interest in the Committee Report.

21           In terms of general comments, you will see  
22 when you see the Framework that we really have adopted

1 a lot of the recommendations that came out of the  
2 report. It was a major contributor to the National  
3 System Framework that will be published.

4 And there have been some differences, but I  
5 think what the Advisory Committee really accomplished  
6 was to bring together incredibly diverse groups of  
7 interest in this important topic and we do appreciate  
8 the work that was done by the last Committee.

9 When you see the Framework, you will see that  
10 we did draw a lot of the content from your  
11 recommendations -- the national criteria, the approach  
12 to regional planning, the concept involving  
13 stakeholders in decision-making, obviously using the  
14 best available science, but also traditional and  
15 customary knowledge -- which was an important addition,  
16 I think, that came out of the discussions of the  
17 Committee -- building obviously upon existing MPA  
18 programs, initiatives and promoting action plans to  
19 identify private priorities particularly on a regional  
20 basis. There's a very strong regional emphasis that  
21 came out of the recommendations of the Committee and  
22 you will see that.



1           There are a few key differences between your  
2 recommendations and the final Framework that you will  
3 see and those were the result of a couple of things:

4           One is: Comments that we heard from over 60  
5 meetings in the past year-and-a-half with federal  
6 agencies, states, organizations and the general public  
7 as well as some technical issues that arose from our  
8 analysis of our Marine Managed Area Inventory,  
9 particularly over the term "lasting", and  
10 recommendations you had about ten years or more.  
11 Reality turned out to be somewhat different from our  
12 perceptions. That is one of the benefits of the  
13 inventory.

14           And I will have Charlie Wahle, when he talks  
15 about the inventory, speak more about the "lasting" and  
16 what we found.

17           We have also added additional criteria for  
18 cultural resources based on some standards out of the  
19 National Register of Historic Places.

20           We are looking as much as possible to ground  
21 the work that we are doing in existing federal  
22 authorities and definitions where it makes sense. The

1 cultural resources area was one where we thought we  
2 could bring some order to our process by using that.

3 We have streamlined the nomination process for  
4 our new or improved sites. There was some concern  
5 raised by both federal and state agencies that the  
6 nomination process was too burdensome at the  
7 governmental level and the same was certainly true for  
8 the nomination of existing sites.

9 What we heard from the states and territories  
10 and federal agencies was that most of the information  
11 that was being sought for the nomination process for  
12 existing sites had already been provided through the  
13 Marine Managed Area Inventory. And what they asked us  
14 to do is consider a process in which the MPA Center  
15 went back and used the data that we had already  
16 collected with the states to come up essentially with a  
17 proposed set of sites from various federal and state  
18 programs and tribal programs that would meet the  
19 requirements or the criteria for a Marine Protected  
20 Area, and then they would have essentially the right of  
21 refusal or joining, so that there is the ability for  
22 people to say "yea" or "nay" in terms of involvement;

1 but, in effect, coming out with the same set or a very  
2 similar set of information that you saw in your  
3 recommendations report, but in this case using the work  
4 that had already been done and essentially not  
5 reinventing a type of wheel.

6 And, finally, we were a little less  
7 prescriptive on implementation. I won't go into too  
8 much detail on that because Jonathan is going to talk  
9 about the Framework.

10 But essentially we are looking at a way to  
11 move this whole process forward in stages, being more  
12 definitive in the near term and less definitive in the  
13 long term, giving people in the region some opportunity  
14 to help shape the future a little bit better and to  
15 help define things further through a comment process on  
16 the draft Framework when that comes out for public  
17 review.

18 In terms of the future issues you raised at  
19 the conclusion of your meeting in May and in your  
20 report, there is a section on "Avoid Harm", how that  
21 has guidance to federal agencies. That will be  
22 published as part of the Framework. That was developed

1 through intensive discussions by the MPA federal  
2 interagency working group coming to some agreement on  
3 how the federal government would approach the whole  
4 "Avoid Harm" issue.

5 We have begun and we have much to do yet on  
6 tribal consultation; but Lauren and myself and Sarah  
7 Fisher, our West Coast MPA Coordinator, did meet with  
8 nine of the northwest tribes a few weeks ago in  
9 Seattle. Again, that is just the beginning. There is  
10 much more to do on that.

11 Lauren Wenzel has agreed to take on the role  
12 of helping us work with the tribes as a tribal liaison.  
13 We don't have the resources right now to have a  
14 full-time tribal person, but we realize we do need to  
15 move forward with that and we will do so.

16 You called for an entity to formally recognize  
17 the designation of Marine Protected Areas and in the  
18 Framework we have defined that essentially through a  
19 process between the MPA Center and the management  
20 agency with some public right to comment.

21 And, finally, the issue of monetary and  
22 nonmonetary incentives is one of the tasks of the new

1 Subcommittee 2 that has been formed.

2 And that is the end of this very short  
3 presentation. I will be happy to try to respond to  
4 comments or questions. Tony?

5 DR. CHATWIN: Tony Chatwin. Thank you, Joe.  
6 I was curious. It sounded like you screened -- almost  
7 like a screening process and that you have a list of  
8 candidates or sites available; and if so, I was  
9 wondering if we could -- you know, it does not have to  
10 be -- I don't know -- about some information you could  
11 share with us.

12 But my thinking of incentives and  
13 implementation in Subcommittee 2, it would be very  
14 interesting to see the type of site that has met the  
15 criteria and screening so that we can start to think  
16 about the monetary and nonmonetary incentives.

17 MR. URAVITCH: We have not done the screening  
18 process yet. The Framework will go forward with the  
19 proposed criteria for Marine Protected Area.

20 What we have done is we have started an  
21 analysis of the MMA Inventory and Charlie Wahle is  
22 going to be speaking of that; but we have not gone and

1 developed any kind of subset at this point. That  
2 officially will have to happen as a result of public  
3 comment on the MPA criteria which will be part of the  
4 draft Framework that goes out for comment.

5 Charlie, did you have anything you wanted to  
6 add on that?

7 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: There's a question here,  
8 Joe. George has a question.

9 MR. URAVITCH: Yeah. I just wanted to finish  
10 up. Do you have any comments on that, where we are?

11 MR. WAHLE: Well, yeah, just briefly. For the  
12 analysis, it looks like a lot of the existing Marine  
13 Managed Areas will be the basic criteria for what is a  
14 Marine Protected Area that will be developed with your  
15 guidance.

16 And then the next question is: What  
17 additional criteria are laying on top of that, to  
18 filter out a few more.

19 But I think the number is going to be  
20 surprisingly large. My guess is over 1,000.

21 MR. URAVITCH: Okay. George Lapointe.

22 MR. LaPOINTE: Thank you, Joe. I have a

1 couple of questions. The first one is: You have a  
2 statement up there, "Implementation less prescriptive."  
3 I understand that people may want it to be less  
4 prescriptive; but it might be more vague if it is less  
5 prescriptive.

6 So, can you please give us a little more  
7 background on what you mean by that?

8 MR. URAVITCH: I think I will turn that one  
9 over to Jonathan at this point.

10 But, basically, we are not trying to direct  
11 people to do specific things. And if you look down the  
12 road, in the Framework you are going to see that we are  
13 more specific now in terms of what needs to be done  
14 procedurally and less specific when we get down to "How  
15 is the system going to function?" "How is it going to  
16 operate?"

17 We think we need to get input not only on our  
18 proposed draft Framework, but we also need to get some  
19 views from the regions in terms of how this is going to  
20 work.

21 So, we wouldn't, for example, say: "These are  
22 the five regions for the country" or "These are the

1 seven regions for the country." We are talking more  
2 about working with existing regional institutions or  
3 forming regional institutions as the appropriate groups  
4 to work with. So, that is one example of being "less  
5 prescriptive".

6 You've got a strong working group in New  
7 England through the Gulf of Maine Council, for example,  
8 so maybe they are the right group to work with rather  
9 than a broader sort of administrative region we might  
10 set up.

11 I think the regional area in particular is  
12 probably the major point.

13 MR. LaPOINTE: Thank you. I have one  
14 follow-up. On the definition of "lasting", you are  
15 seeking input from other stakeholders on the  
16 recommendation for sustainable production being ten  
17 years.

18 What are your thoughts right now? I mean  
19 clearly people did not like ten years. Is five better?  
20 Is 15 better? And why?

21 MR. URAVITCH: Charlie, you have worked more  
22 than I have with this one.



1           MR. WAHLE: Actually, I think maybe Jonathan  
2 is probably the one to ask this one to.

3           MR. URAVITCH: Who can we ask this to?

4           MR. KELSEY: Well, actually, you know, maybe  
5 that might be a good cycle into the next presentation,  
6 when I can go over some of those details the way they  
7 exist now -- unless there are other general questions  
8 for Joe.

9           MR. URAVITCH: Yeah.

10          MR. KELSEY: Because there are some more  
11 specifics that I can go over as far as where we are,  
12 right now anyway, on those kinds of issues.

13          CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Bob?

14          MR. BENDICK: Well, it seems the response --  
15 My name is Bob Bendick. The response would impose a  
16 major question that we have wrestled with from the  
17 beginning of this, and that is: Whether the "System"  
18 is really an inventory, a kind of formal inventory of  
19 Marine Protected Areas made up of different systems and  
20 things or rather it is a -- I don't know what the right  
21 word is -- a more positive system that tries to  
22 represent the diversity of natural and cultural areas

1 around the country and with that goes money, additional  
2 protection status, the consequence we've talked about,  
3 and the response to the group.

4 Our report was moving more in the second  
5 direction, I thought. The response to the report is  
6 moving more in the direction of, you know, a formal  
7 inventory of Marine Protected Areas.

8 And I'm not sure what your response might be;  
9 but it is interesting that the responses to our  
10 individual recommendations fall into that pattern.

11 MR. URAVITCH: You will see from Jonathan's  
12 discussion of the Framework that I think the latter is  
13 more the case. I would say it is both.

14 The first stage is: Understanding and making  
15 sense of what we have to start with as the foundation  
16 for the National System.

17 But the next phase down the pike is: So,  
18 where do we go from here? This is what we have. We  
19 can do a better job of integrating that; but what else  
20 is necessary to really have a truly functioning system  
21 that is going to do a good job in protecting natural  
22 and cultural resources and sustainable production.

1           So, the first stage, the one you call the  
2     "inventory stage", is just making sense out of what  
3     already exists. And that is really where we are now  
4     with steps in the process which will get us to that  
5     next point.

6           Yes, Eric?

7           MR. GILMAN: Real quick question. Does the  
8     MPA Center have a schedule for bringing the National  
9     System online?

10          MR. URAVITCH: Yeah. That is going to be part  
11     of Jonathan's presentation, so --

12          Let's see. Anything on the Recommendations  
13     Report? Yes, Jim?

14          MR. WOODS: You know, I'm still getting myself  
15     up to speed here as a new member of the Committee;  
16     however, I just wanted to kind of touch on the  
17     "Cultural Resource" definition. I know we talked a  
18     little bit about this with the Coastal Treaty Tribes in  
19     Seattle a couple of weeks ago.

20          I think that there is a lot of concern with  
21     the Coastal Tribes on how that definition unfolds and,  
22     as your slide pointed out, it was based on the National

1 Register of Historic Places. And I would like to see  
2 more elaboration on that definition, at least in our  
3 document.

4 MR. URAVITCH: Okay. It sounds to me like  
5 what we really need to do is work on drafting a section  
6 that relates particularly to Tribal Policies as part of  
7 "Cultural Resources", I mean; but what we tried to  
8 separate out are traditional uses from the sort of  
9 artifacts side of all of this.

10 But it sounds like there is further work to be  
11 done and we ought to sit down with Brian Jordan as well  
12 sometime, our archaeologist, and talk about where this  
13 is going, because it's a very complicated issue and I  
14 don't want to say something I don't mean.

15 MR. WOODS: Thank you.

16 MR. URAVITCH: Bonnie?

17 VICE CHAIRPERSON DR. BONNIE McCAY: Yes. On  
18 that note, I am also concerned from what I read here  
19 about basically the work that we go through in drafting  
20 definitions may not be warranted. Perhaps we should  
21 not have put so much effort into it if we really are  
22 going to be bound by existing legal structures, legal

1 framework, legal definitions that are already used by  
2 the agencies.

3 And I'm hoping that as we go into the next  
4 phase of our work that we will have a little more help  
5 with that. Because we did put a lot of effort into  
6 "Cultural Resources", for example, and I think there's  
7 other definitions here, too.

8 That we may want to revisit and find out  
9 whether there is any hope of getting our work accepted.

10 MR. URAVITCH: Right. Well, we are not  
11 ignoring your work, as you will see in the Framework;  
12 but we also had to listen to the states and the  
13 territories and the tribes and the stakeholders and the  
14 federal agencies in drafting the Framework.

15 So, what you are going to see in the Framework  
16 is a blend of your recommendations, which were really a  
17 significant starting point for where this is, but you  
18 are also going to see some differences.

19 But, yeah, where we need some clarification or  
20 things seem a bit off track, that is what we have an  
21 Advisory Committee for is to help us get back on track.  
22 So, we appreciation that.

1 MR. URAVITCH: Yeah, Bob Zales?

2 MR. ZALES: Bob Zales, II. That is kind of my  
3 question. Where is the Framework?

4 I'm assuming that not only will that be sent  
5 out for public comment, but it also -- and hopefully  
6 before it goes out for public comment -- will be  
7 brought before this Committee so that we can go over  
8 this thing and make further recommendations to it and  
9 provide -- well, actually, we probably won't be  
10 listened to, but at least have that opportunity to do  
11 so.

12 MR. URAVITCH: Yeah. Jonathan is going to  
13 cover that in his presentation after this is done.

14 But we are in final review between the  
15 agencies and we expect that it will be released very  
16 shortly; but certainly all the Committee members will  
17 get that and have an opportunity to comment on it.

18 Any additional questions?

19 (No audible response.)

20 MR. URAVITCH: All right. I will turn it over  
21 to Jonathan Kelsey then.

22 MR. KELSEY: Good morning. I hope the

1 information I will present to you here in the next few  
2 minutes will help answer some of the questions that you  
3 guys have raised already. I anticipate that it might  
4 also open up the door for a few more as well. But we  
5 will do our best to try and give you a sense of where  
6 things are headed.

7           While you all have been on sort of an extended  
8 and sort of unexpected hiatus for the past year, we  
9 have been pretty busy working with some of our federal  
10 partners to think about your recommendations and all  
11 the input that we received from other stakeholders to  
12 draft this draft "Framework for Developing the National  
13 System of Marine Protected Areas".

14           I want to start out by just giving a little  
15 bit of disclaimer -- and Joe mentioned this -- that the  
16 document right now is in final clearance by NOAA and  
17 DOI. So, the details of what will come out for public  
18 comment -- hopefully, maybe within the next several  
19 weeks to a month -- may be different than some of the  
20 details that I talk about here today.

21           But I do want to try and give you a sense of  
22 where we are anyways. So, for the next few minutes, I

1 will try and give you a little bit more of a general  
2 overview with a few details about some of the specific  
3 components that the Framework deals with.

4 I want to start out by just saying the draft  
5 Framework is really a proposal based on the  
6 partnerships and input we have received over the past  
7 four-or-so years and more specifically over the past  
8 year-and-a-half or so with some of these bulleted items  
9 that are up there, starting out with your  
10 recommendations, some ongoing review from the federal  
11 agencies, taking your recommendation to listen  
12 seriously to what the states have to say.

13 We put some investment into getting state  
14 recommendations and considering those -- in some of our  
15 initial tribal consultations, also. We have had a  
16 number of formal regional public dialogues, five of  
17 them around the country, and roughly 50 other meetings  
18 where we presented information, gathered feedback.

19 As Joe talked about, we have done some of the  
20 preliminary analysis on the data reflected in the  
21 Marine Managed Area Inventory and Charlie will go into  
22 more detail on that.



1           So, the general overview I'm about to give is  
2 really a proposal based on all this information. It is  
3 not an MPA Center proposal or a federal proposal, but  
4 what we think is the best way to go about developing a  
5 National System. It is really our proposal putting  
6 forward what we think the best balance is from all of  
7 these different perspectives that we have heard and we  
8 have heard a whole variety as we have gone around the  
9 country.

10           So, ultimately, the document could change  
11 between now and when it is released for public comment.  
12 And even beyond that, the goal with putting a document  
13 out for public comment is to give a wider view of folks  
14 an opportunity to take a look at the substance and have  
15 some follow-up discussions and receive some additional  
16 feedback so that we can draft a final that really meets  
17 what the Nation's interests are and tries to balance  
18 what those interests are.

19           So, with that, the Framework is really a road  
20 map for developing the National System. It is not a  
21 blueprint. It does not outline specific outcomes that  
22 must be achieved; but, instead, it defines some broad

1 boundaries, the bounds of this road map, and then  
2 outlines some processes that could take you down any  
3 number of paths or any number of routes, depending on  
4 the various perspectives that different MPA partners or  
5 stakeholders may have.

6           What we have heard as we have gone around the  
7 country, and a key principle in this Framework, is that  
8 it really needs to be adaptive and flexible. I think  
9 you all have heard this as you have gone around the  
10 country as well that how and why people use MPAs and  
11 the extent to which they use them varies by every  
12 region.

13           So, in order to be effective, a National  
14 System really needs to be adaptive to be able to  
15 respond to those and flexible to take those into  
16 account; not to duplicate existing efforts that have  
17 already happened, but really support and enhance them  
18 as they move forward.

19           You have also heard that there is lots of  
20 existing efforts going on and that the best role for a  
21 National System would be what we have sort of coined as  
22 a "System of Systems", because lots of these MPAs exist

1 in systems already -- National Marine Sanctuary  
2 Systems, the Florida Aquatic Preserve Systems, and then  
3 there are a number of individuals sites that are out  
4 there outside of programmatic-type systems.

5 So, what we have heard is that the best thing  
6 that a National System can do is really to focus on  
7 linking among all of those different efforts that are  
8 going on, not duplicating the efforts of individual  
9 programs, and linking among the sites that they all  
10 have mandates to manage.

11 Another major principle is that the National  
12 System and the Framework should be comprehensive,  
13 looking at all the different purposes for which MPAs  
14 are used and then, unlike sort of the status quo that  
15 is out there, try to integrate across all of those  
16 different efforts.

17 And we found a number of very good examples  
18 for integrating across those efforts that we can build  
19 off of and there are some planned efforts for that kind  
20 of integration that we can work with as we move forward  
21 as well.

22 And the final principle is that the National

1 System and the Framework should really take a hard look  
2 and be based on ecosystem and regional approaches while  
3 maintaining sort of a national outlook to connect  
4 across those various regions and also to look  
5 internationally and on the broader context for what the  
6 national interest is.

7 So, what is in the Framework?

8 Well, there's basically two big sections of  
9 the Framework. The first is sort of providing the  
10 foundation -- outlining, providing definitions and the  
11 "big think" kinds of components for the National  
12 System. And that starts off with some background and  
13 rationale and some of the benefits that we see coming  
14 forward as we build a collaborative National System.

15 We talked a bit about what we found through  
16 the preliminary analysis of the Marine Managed Areas  
17 Inventory and what we have heard in various meetings  
18 around the country about what a National System should  
19 do and why we need it.

20 The draft Framework also outlines and provides  
21 the three underlying themes -- and these have had  
22 various names over time. And as we have grabbed a hold

1 of them in the Framework, we have kind of broadened  
2 them out to be the themes for all the efforts that  
3 happen as we move forward. They both address the  
4 principle of being comprehensive and they also help to  
5 reinforce the need for integrating across these three  
6 areas.

7 And these three themes are ones that were put  
8 forward in the Federal Advisory Committee  
9 recommendations and ones that rang true as we looked at  
10 the purposes for which people are using MPAs around the  
11 country and using Marine Managed Areas around the  
12 country.

13 We also outlined some guiding principles that  
14 I went over already, so I won't rehash those.

15 Continuing on in the sort of foundation that  
16 the Framework provides, we outline National System  
17 goals -- which ought to look very familiar to you  
18 all -- a set of objectives for each of those goals, and  
19 we take the "Marine Protected Area" definition from the  
20 Executive Order and define the criteria. And Joe  
21 talked a little bit about those.

22 The first -- I will go back to these goals.

1 The first of the goals really focuses in on the  
2 conservation and management purposes for which MPAs are  
3 being used in the U.S. and the National System embraces  
4 those and incorporates them in this goal.

5 The second goal is really about stewardship  
6 and priorities to improve the effectiveness of the  
7 National System and those participating sites and  
8 systems that are a member or a participant.

9 And the third is about enhancing effective  
10 coordination and integration both within the site, but  
11 within the broader context of international efforts and  
12 the ecosystem management efforts.

13 There are a litany of National System  
14 objectives, which I won't go into detail on; but the  
15 Advisory Committee's recommendations were instrumental  
16 in drafting those objectives.

17 And then, as Joe talked a little bit about, we  
18 have used the Executive Order definition for "MPA".  
19 And, as it turns out, when we looked at the definitions  
20 for the criteria of "area", "marine environment",  
21 "reserve", "lasting" and "protection", with the  
22 exception of "lasting", when we started looking at the

1 Inventory, the definitions that we had seemed very  
2 appropriate and we have pulled those forward from the  
3 Advisory Committee recommendations and what we started  
4 with from "Marine Managed Area" into this Framework.

5 When we got to "lasting" and started to look  
6 at the Inventory, we found that actually most sites are  
7 put in place indefinitely; and, so, we -- right now  
8 anyways -- are putting forward a definition of  
9 "lasting" that is established at the time of  
10 designation with the intent to provide permanent  
11 protection and we have added some additional caveats  
12 and descriptors in there to help account for some of  
13 the ways that sustainable production sites are put into  
14 place for permanent protection, for rebuilding certain  
15 stocks or meeting biological goals.

16 Beyond sort of providing the foundation that I  
17 just talked about in the past couple of slides, it also  
18 talks about how we can move forward collaboratively to  
19 build the structure on top of that foundation.

20 This gets to some of the questions that were  
21 just coming up. And, again, I will reiterate that this  
22 is where the document currently stands, but this could

1 change as we move through NOAA and DOI clearance.

2 But the first of these three processes, which  
3 is for nominating and including existing MPAs -- and I  
4 want to highlight the word "existing", because this is  
5 not about identifying new areas or nominating new areas  
6 that should become MPAs. It is a bit of a streamline  
7 process that starts out with the MPA Center looking at  
8 the Marine Managed Area Inventory and identifying those  
9 sites in there that are eligible.

10 Then the next step would be to contact or  
11 start a dialogue with the agency that manages that site  
12 to determine if they are interested in nominating the  
13 site to be a part of the National System; and if so,  
14 putting those sites out for some public comment  
15 relative to the criteria for which they have been  
16 nominated.

17 Then we would provide that public comment back  
18 to the agency that manages the site and they can make a  
19 final determination on whether they would like to  
20 participate in considering that public comment that  
21 they received. So that is the most sort of formulaic  
22 of the processes that are there.



1           As we move forward into the next -- that is  
2 really sort of where the rubber hits the road and where  
3 some of the benefits of having a National System starts  
4 to come forward, is once you have brought a bunch of  
5 partners to the table under the context of this  
6 National System, the Framework outlines some processes  
7 for basically facilitating a dialogue among those  
8 various partners to understand, first of all, what does  
9 "regional" mean to them, what is an effective and  
10 relevant meaning for "regional" when we are thinking  
11 about and talking about MPA issues.

12           So, it is really getting folks that are  
13 talking about what that means, and then talking about  
14 what is "meaningful coordination" to them. Is it a  
15 list serve or a web site or is it monthly meetings or  
16 conference calls and really trying to elicit those  
17 kinds of recommendations and that kind of appropriate  
18 structure out of those dialogues, and then talking  
19 about what are the stewardship priorities that the  
20 various partners under that regional entity has.

21           So, this is going back to the question that I  
22 think maybe Bob was asking Joe, in that the Framework

1 outlines a general discussion that would be had among  
2 the various partners under the National System, but  
3 does not prescribe any particular outcome. It is  
4 really about having the partners define what those  
5 processes would be and what the priorities are that  
6 they would be working on.

7 And once that initial discussion about  
8 coordination and sort of stewardship priorities is  
9 ongoing, then discussion could be facilitated about  
10 identifying gaps in future conservation priorities,  
11 although that is a little bit further down the road.

12 And, again, this has the same take in the  
13 Framework, which is that there is no prescribed outcome  
14 for this; but, rather, sort of an evolutionary dialogue  
15 that would happen among partners at the regional level,  
16 where they can determine if and how to go down this  
17 path of using various layers of science and analyses to  
18 look at gaps and future conservation priorities.

19 The Framework also outlines, as Joe alluded  
20 to, some guidance on the MPA Executive Order, Section  
21 5, which we commonly refer to as "Avoid Harm". This is  
22 a different approach. This section says that

1 "Agencies, to the extent permitted by law and to the  
2 maximum extent practicable, should avoid harming  
3 resources that are protected by National System MPAs  
4 for all intents and purposes."

5 And what the draft Framework outlines is three  
6 important pieces of information about this "Avoid Harm"  
7 requirement:

8 The first is that it is an individual agency  
9 requirement. It is not something that the National  
10 System or any one agency or the MPA Center oversees.  
11 It is something that each agency has to meet in and of  
12 itself.

13 The second is that, because this is under an  
14 Executive Order, that the way the agencies go about  
15 meeting their requirements are sort of threefold:

16 One: They have to look at the activity that  
17 they are taking relative to the resources that are  
18 protected by an MPA.

19 Two: They have to look at the regulatory  
20 requirements of that MPA that are in existence.

21 Three: They have to look at what are the  
22 existing natural, environmental or cultural resource

1 review processes, likes NEPA or something, that they  
2 would already have to go through.

3 So, the bottom line is that how the  
4 requirements of "Avoid Harm" are met are dependent upon  
5 each instance for which an agency is taking a look at  
6 that requirement and that there is no over-arching or  
7 prescriptive guidelines or additional scrutiny that  
8 "Avoid Harm" sets out; but, rather, it is sort of like  
9 another lens through which agencies can look at their  
10 activities, the MPA lens, and how they are affecting  
11 resources that are protected by MPAs in the National  
12 System.

13 But beyond sort of that side of the "Avoid  
14 Harm" piece, the document also talks a bit about how  
15 the MPA Center and the participating agencies can  
16 facilitate agencies and support agencies in meeting  
17 these requirements.

18 So, one example of that is that we do need to  
19 make sure that there is a good list of all the MPAs  
20 that are in the National System so that agencies know  
21 where MPAs are when they are taking activities, the  
22 types of resources that are protected, who they should

1 be contacting, et cetera. So, there is that piece of  
2 information that the National System can provide to  
3 agencies to help them in meeting their requirements.

4 Then there is also the opportunity where the  
5 MPA Center and partners can provide technical  
6 assistance to agencies upon request, if they are so  
7 interested, in helping to determine if their  
8 activities, for example, meet our "causing harm" or  
9 not.

10 So, there is the side that talks about the  
11 existing or the sort of -- the agency process for  
12 meeting the requirement; but, then, there is some  
13 additional assistance that could be provided from the  
14 National System to those agencies.

15 The Framework also outlines the annual  
16 reporting requirements that are found in the Executive  
17 Order, but also proposes a biennial report that  
18 outlines sort of the accomplishments and priorities  
19 that have been achieved and defined over the course of  
20 two years. And that is really in order to try and pull  
21 in the nonfederal partner accomplishments and  
22 priorities which would not normally be caught under

1 these agency annual reports that are required by the  
2 Executive Order.

3 And, then, finally, the Framework outlines a  
4 very general process for developing performance  
5 measures. It talks about seeking input from the FAC  
6 and from other stakeholders and participating MPAs as  
7 the National System gets going to develop a relevant  
8 set of performance measures for the National System,  
9 but not for individual sites, for example.

10 And this is general at this point because it  
11 would be fairly presumptuous to establish a set of  
12 performance indicators, not having established a  
13 National System yet, with sites populated.

14 So, just briefly, to run through the last few  
15 slides here, we think that the Framework as it exists  
16 provides a pretty flexible and efficient way to quickly  
17 get to work on the National System and provide some  
18 meaningful and relevant benefits to MPA programs and  
19 stakeholders around the country. We list a few of  
20 these here.

21 Our next steps really are to complete the  
22 review and approval from NOAA and DOI over the next

1 month or so and provide probably a 145-day public  
2 comment period.

3 And the reason why we would go with such a  
4 lengthy public comment period is because a number of  
5 organizations -- for example, fishery management  
6 councils -- meet on a quarterly basis, so your standard  
7 90-day public comment period may not actually give  
8 those folks an opportunity to formulate their comments.

9 We will distribute the draft Framework by the  
10 MPA.gov web site E-mail list and through organizations  
11 and partners and also through the FAC to make sure that  
12 it is as broadly distributed as possible.

13 In the fall of this year, we would take a look  
14 at the comments that we received and revise the  
15 Framework and develop a response to comments that we  
16 would eventually publish after NOAA and DOI approve it  
17 and we would have some materials that would go along  
18 with that final probe -- press releases and press  
19 conferences, et cetera.

20 Once we publish that final Framework, we start  
21 then implementing it -- go down the road of identifying  
22 and nominating those existing sites that are there,

1 looking to try and establish that initial National  
2 System of existing sites maybe by the end of 2007.

3 And after that, we can start to have some  
4 regional discussions to scope out efforts at that level  
5 to identify shared stewardship priorities and build  
6 some initiatives both at the regional and national  
7 level to begin to address some of those common issue;  
8 and then further down the road, look at developing the  
9 science and tools needed to identify gaps in the  
10 National System.

11 So, again, I would like to just reiterate that  
12 these are sort of some of the details that we have  
13 pulled together thus far, but what comes forward in the  
14 final draft for public comment could be different than  
15 what I have described here, based on where we end up  
16 out at the other side of NOAA and the Department of the  
17 Interior review.

18 And sort of just a general statement here at  
19 the end is -- and I think this goes to the question  
20 someone had raised before -- is that the overall  
21 approach that we have taken here with the National  
22 System is to be inclusive, really to build upon the



1 variety of efforts that are out there as opposed to  
2 being exclusive and looking only at, for example, the  
3 jewels in the crown and having a very fine filter. And  
4 we think that this is probably, from what we have heard  
5 anyways, the approach that sort of balances the various  
6 perspectives that we have seen in the best way.

7 So, with that, if there are any questions.

8 Wally?

9 DR. PEREYRA: Yes, Jonathan. In your review  
10 process, are you anticipating that there will be any  
11 sort of a formal consensus FAC response or are you  
12 anticipating that we will, as individuals, be  
13 responding to the review process?

14 MR. KELSEY: I think in the review process,  
15 the way we are envisioning right now, is that, as  
16 individuals, the Advisory Committee could provide  
17 comments, if they so desired; but that we are not  
18 asking for a formal -- right now anyways -- a formal  
19 FAC response back. I think what we are interested in,  
20 and as Mary talks about the Charge, is sort of the next  
21 steps for moving forward and taking this to sort of the  
22 next level.

1 Mark?

2 DR. HIXON: Thanks for that, Jonathan. One of  
3 the biggest issues we dealt with in the last round was  
4 the definition of "lasting". It was very contentious  
5 and it took a lot of time to finally reach some  
6 consensus.

7 Can you, given that we can't see the Framework  
8 yet in its entirety, can you even give us the current  
9 definition that you are using or, if it is at the table  
10 or something, make that available to us at this time or  
11 is that just not possible?

12 MR. KELSEY: Well, the current definition is  
13 your definition of "indefinite", which was established  
14 at the time of designation with the intent to provide  
15 permanent protection, and we have added some additional  
16 descriptive information beyond that based on input from  
17 other federal agencies and also in taking a hard look  
18 at the Marine Managed Area Inventory.

19 DR. HIXON: So, just to follow-up, so the part  
20 of our document that spoke of "indefinite protection"  
21 is pretty much for everything. Okay. Thank you.

22 MR. KELSEY: Bob?

1 MR. ZALES: There are a couple of things.

2 Number one -- Because I think part of my issue with the  
3 Framework is to come out of the Gulf of Mexico when --  
4 when -- and dealing with the Council.

5 When you mention Framework, that is a  
6 procedure that they established that kind of bypasses a  
7 lot of public input on stuff like this. That appears,  
8 to me, the way you talk about it, framework for what  
9 probably is a site that won't be there is going to be a  
10 little bit different definition.

11 You have talked about two different  
12 Frameworks, so I want to get clear in my mind what that  
13 is. And I would suggest that whatever that is, that  
14 when you send this out --

15 Like if you send something to the Gulf  
16 Council, I can pretty well assure you right now that  
17 the 17 members sitting at that table, when they see  
18 "Framework", they are going to say: "Okay. This is a  
19 new way to kind of skirt around some of the public  
20 process."

21 So it's got to be clearly defined to those  
22 people that it probably is not what they are used to,

1 it seems like.

2 MR. KELSEY: That is a really important piece  
3 of information. And I appreciate that. Because the  
4 idea here is not to skirt around the public process or  
5 the agency process. It is really to provide some ideas  
6 about how we can move forward and have that agency and  
7 public dialogue.

8 MR. ZALES: Okay. And my next question is  
9 similar to what Mark was talking about, because we are  
10 talking about this definition. And I think clearly  
11 now, more than ever, with what we experienced in the  
12 Gulf of Mexico last year with the hurricane system that  
13 was there, if we are going to define MPA protection  
14 lengths and you are going to create an MPA, that you  
15 could get into a situation that we discussed when we  
16 were playing with these definitions that you may  
17 establish an MPA and you may have some natural event  
18 like Katrina that comes through, and you have got an  
19 MPA that was established, Katrina may change that whole  
20 scope of that area. It could totally wipe it out, so  
21 there would be no longer any reason to have that MPA  
22 there.

1           So that is going to need to be considered,  
2       because I think we have learned a lot in the past year  
3       that we suspected, but we did not know for sure,  
4       certain.

5           MR. KELSEY:   Sure.   And we very generally  
6       outlined something in here which says that if that were  
7       to happen, for example, to an MPA, that basically that  
8       agency could let the National System know and we could  
9       take that MPA off the list.   But it is up to,  
10      obviously, that individual agency that manages the site  
11      to make any kind of decision about whether that MPA  
12      continues or does not continue based on those kinds of  
13      impacts.

14           Tony?

15           DR. CHATWIN:   A case of verification.   I have  
16      a concern -- and it probably comes from not having seen  
17      enough information about this particular aspect -- but  
18      when you talked about the regions and establishing  
19      regions and having a very participatory approach to  
20      define within which priorities were going to be  
21      established and, let's see, management collaborations  
22      were going to be established, I am all for the

1 participatory nature of the public process described.

2 I am concerned, however, if we do not go into  
3 the proposed layout of regions, there may be gaps. If  
4 you have communities that are not particularly  
5 interested in one part that lies between two regions  
6 that are of interest, who is going to be responsible  
7 for making sure that that region is analyzed?

8 So, my recommendation is that the Framework be  
9 very clear about the regional boundaries, the proposed  
10 regional boundaries based on biogeographic information  
11 for setting priorities for the natural heritage issues.  
12 The same with cultural heritage.

13 I think it is important to go into this public  
14 comment period with something that the public can react  
15 to. Because just based on what was described, it just  
16 says: "Well, we will establish a participatory process  
17 to define the regions," I don't think you will  
18 necessarily get the public comments that you might want  
19 to -- that might benefit this draft of the Framework.

20 MR. KELSEY: I can just give you a little bit  
21 of feedback about what we heard and how we ended up not  
22 specifying specific regions at this point. It was

1 largely because there are so many regional efforts  
2 already happening and that we needed to really  
3 understand what those various regional efforts are, not  
4 duplicate the work that they are already doing, and try  
5 and build off of and support those.

6 For example, you have the Gulf of Mexico  
7 Alliance that is taking off right now and you have  
8 other efforts that are more incipient and some that are  
9 further along like the Gulf of Maine Council. So, we  
10 did not want to be prescriptive in the sense that we  
11 were duplicating those existing efforts that folks had  
12 told us very clearly that we should be building off of.

13 I think it's a valid comment and we will  
14 certainly mull it over in the next several weeks as we  
15 are moving through this final clearance process; but I  
16 think it is -- we did hear a lot from various  
17 stakeholders as we went around that we needed to really  
18 look at those existing structures that are out there  
19 and figure out how we can both support and work with  
20 them.

21 I think getting to the point of the gaps or  
22 what might be left out by going down that road, I think

1     that is where having a National System comes into  
2     play -- that you do have that larger national outlook  
3     that can spot those kinds of gaps as they are  
4     occurring, if they do occur.

5             I'm not sure if that completely addresses the  
6     concern that you have, obviously; but that is sort of  
7     the one benefit for having -- or not the one. That is  
8     one of the benefits for having the national outlook.

9             Tundi?

10            DR. AGARDY: Tundi Agardy. I don't want to  
11     open a can of worms; but I notice that you inserted  
12     some language about what you had done in terms of  
13     discussing the "Avoid Harm" issue. I think for the  
14     edification of the new members, it might be useful to  
15     just go into that in a little bit more detail.

16            For the new members, that is something -- an  
17     issue that came up very late in the game. It just came  
18     up at the last meeting. There was a lot of kind of  
19     reticence to delve into that too deeply at the last  
20     meeting because we had a sense we were making progress,  
21     we were afraid of becoming derailed by the discussion  
22     that talks about specifically what "Avoid Harm" means



1 and how it pertains to the National System.

2 But I wondered if in your deliberations, as  
3 you developed a discussion around what the guidelines  
4 would look like for "Avoiding Harm", whether there was  
5 thought about what the implications of inserting that  
6 language into something that is so preliminary and  
7 whether there was a discussion among the federal  
8 agencies in particular about the possibility of  
9 creating a disincentive by even bringing up the "Avoid  
10 Harm" language.

11 MR. KELSEY: Well, I think there is two sides  
12 of that coin, is that there could be just as much  
13 disincentive by sort of just ignoring it as well and  
14 not sort of tackling it in some way in the document.

15 And, so, we didn't want to have an air that we  
16 were avoiding "Avoid Harm" or that it was, you know, it  
17 was something that we were going to leave as sort of an  
18 unspoken rule that would happen willy-nilly, however it  
19 happened.

20 We wanted to provide a clear message to the  
21 public and to partners about what it really means. And  
22 what it really means is that the use of existing

1 cultural and environmental review processes and the  
2 regulations that go along with the various MPAs that  
3 become a part of the National System to take, you know,  
4 another look at federal activities as they are being  
5 thought about and as they are actually happening.

6 So, I think we were trying to balance  
7 providing some clearer understanding and some clearer  
8 guidance out there to the general public.

9 And in particular, also, one of the things  
10 that we have talked about and we've included is some  
11 clear guidance on what the public should do if they  
12 have an issue about "Avoid Harm" and an agency's  
13 meeting or not meeting its requirements under that.  
14 And we have reinforced that this is an individual  
15 agency requirement and that if the public, for example,  
16 has an issue or a comment about a particular agency's  
17 actions that they need to go directly to that agency  
18 and not come to the MPA Center or to another agency;  
19 that these are individual agency requirements and that  
20 dialogue should be happening through the dialogues that  
21 are set up through NEPA or through the other processes  
22 that would apply.

1           So, I'm not sure if that exactly answers your  
2       questions; but I think that the underlying reason why  
3       we did want to put something in there is so that we  
4       were addressing it more head-on and providing some  
5       clearer understanding to the public about what it means  
6       and what it does not mean.

7           DR. AGARDY: I guess maybe the question is  
8       really more directed towards Dan, whether we have the  
9       opportunity as a Committee to at some point discuss  
10      "Avoid Harm" in the detail that it deserves and develop  
11      some recommendations by the Committee -- because it  
12      could go both ways, I think.

13          MR. KELSEY: Okay. Jim Woods?

14          MR. WOODS: Jonathan, I just wanted to touch  
15      on a couple of things here real quick. I know that  
16      this Committee has not met for like over 11 months now  
17      and I can see a great deal of work that you have done  
18      just in your presentation, what you are talking about  
19      with this Framework.

20                When we talk about "natural heritage" or "the  
21      sustainable production", "cultural heritage", it brings  
22      up the same concern I had earlier on the fact that the

1 tribes are still in the infancy of this consultation  
2 process of the outreach from the Center to the tribes  
3 and I guess I have a little bit of concern on how much  
4 is going to be taken into effect or into account, I  
5 should say, with the Framework when we still have those  
6 vague areas of interpretation of these definitions on,  
7 you know, "cultural" or "natural resource".

8 MR. KELSEY: I think Brian Jordan is going to  
9 speak to us a little bit tomorrow.

10 But going back to how I sort of started off  
11 this discussion, the door is not closed, by any means,  
12 on this document. I mean we are just looking forward  
13 to getting something out there now that reflects what  
14 we have heard thus far; but we anticipate hearing a lot  
15 more and we look forward to hearing a lot more to take  
16 the document sort of to the next level, which is  
17 ultimately reaching having something that is final that  
18 MPA, government agencies and stakeholders around the  
19 country can, you know, feel comfortable with.

20 So, I think that there are still lots of  
21 opportunities -- and Joe is going to speak to this --  
22 for tribal consultation, input and -- and we certainly

1 are looking forward to expanding on that.

2 Joe?

3 MR. URAVITCH: Yeah. Joe Uravitch. Yeah,  
4 Jim, I mean this is -- you know, once this is out for  
5 comment, it will be out for comment for a long period  
6 of time; but there is no reason why we also can't  
7 continue to do tribal consultation as a parallel  
8 process to this.

9 I truly understand your concerns and we will  
10 definitely work with you and other tribes to make sure  
11 that this gets where it needs to go by the end and that  
12 the tribes are comfortable with where we are going.

13 MR. KELSEY: Jim Ray?

14 DR. RAY: I would like to come back to -- This  
15 is Jim Ray. I would like to come back to the point  
16 that Tundi raised about the "Avoid Harm". Depending on  
17 what is being put out to the public for comment, we  
18 have to be absolutely clear on how you intend to define  
19 and use "Avoid Harm" because it makes a big difference  
20 on how the various different stakeholders may feel or  
21 comment about MPAs. Depending on how you define it  
22 depends on whether or not you have multiple use of

1 areas.

2 So, it will be an area that the public and  
3 various stakeholders groups will be very interested in  
4 knowing exactly how you intend to use "Avoid Harm".

5 MR. KELSEY: Joe has a comment.

6 MR. URAVITCH: Yeah. This is Joe Uravitch. I  
7 mean ultimately what you have to remember is "Avoid  
8 Harm" is based in the authority of the agency taking  
9 the action or managing the Marine Protected Area. So,  
10 you've got to go back to that fundamental authority or  
11 that agency, whether it's the Marine Sanctuary Program,  
12 the Park Service, a state counterpart, Army Corps of  
13 Engineers and their permits, those are the fundamental  
14 authorities and responsibilities that they have.

15 The Executive Order does not give agencies any  
16 new authorities to do things. We are in an attempt to  
17 try and coordinate the work across these agencies and  
18 programs and improve collaboration. So you have got to  
19 go back to the fundamental underlying authority of  
20 those agencies that either manage the MPA or are  
21 undertaking that action.

22 DR. RAY: If I may just respond to it. An

1     awful lot of what we are trying to accomplish in the  
2     future with MPAs is in the communication and the  
3     acceptance by the public. And you have an awful lot of  
4     public that is not very trusting. And, so, that is  
5     why, when it comes to an issue like "Avoid Harm", it  
6     needs to be very clear.

7             An awful lot of the government bureaucratic  
8     gobbledygook does not mean anything to Joe Average  
9     Public. If you want their trust, you have to be very  
10    clear when you talk about things like "Avoid Harm".

11            MR. KELSEY: George?

12            MR. LaPOINTE: If I can follow up. And, yes,  
13    it relates to the activities of federal agencies and  
14    the individual MPAs. But when we talk about the EEZ,  
15    which is a big part of our coastal waters, it is all  
16    about federal agencies.

17            So, I think Jim's points and Tundi's points  
18    are well taken -- that, in fact, I think it is an issue  
19    that the committee has to deal with because every  
20    activity out there, multiple-use activities, single-use  
21    activities, are governed by some underlying federal  
22    authority. So, I think it is an issue that is high on

1 my list, anyway.

2 MR. KELSEY: Lelei?

3 MR. PEAU: I'm Lelei Peau, American Samoa.

4 Jonathan, I would like to come back on the  
5 selection process. I think I am a strong proponent of  
6 the notion of protective and flexibility process. At  
7 the same time, I'm also very cautious on getting a  
8 process where criteria are not in place to promote or  
9 enhance the existing MPAs.

10 And I guess one of my fears is not really  
11 having the opportunity to really review the MMA  
12 Inventory that's been going on for quite some time.

13 In the situation -- You did touch on the fact  
14 that the regional as well as federal agencies  
15 involvement on the selection. It's unclear to me where  
16 there are opportunities where communities want to be  
17 part of the program, but they want to be independent in  
18 the sense that they do not want to be part of the  
19 Federal National MPA. I do not see any recognition on  
20 that and a springboard, let alone --

21 One other thing that I did bring up in our  
22 discussion in the past, that there are opportunities in



1 the Islands where they can network with international  
2 communities. I do not see that in the Framework.

3 The last thing I would like to make note of  
4 that I did not see in the Framework is the evaluation  
5 process. I mean this is all good. I think our  
6 intention is we want to have a system that is  
7 sustainable; but we need to come back to some sort of  
8 form and basis.

9 I recognize that it is premature to talk about  
10 at this point in time, but I think there needs to be  
11 some -- a placeholder of evaluation in the Framework so  
12 that we know that we can come back and see how well we  
13 have satisfied those criteria and have an opportunity  
14 to make changes again so that the 50 local situations  
15 or whatever can tell us specifics.

16 MR. KELSEY: Going back to your first comment  
17 about local communities, the Framework recognizes, just  
18 as states or federal agencies, that there are local  
19 communities that have either co-management authority or  
20 independent authority to manage Marine Protected Areas.  
21 There are tribal governments that have authorities and  
22 either co-manage or have other management arrangements

1 for Marine Protected Areas.

2 And I think that, you know, to the extent by  
3 which sites meet the criteria for the National System  
4 that there is an opportunity for all of them to  
5 participate and their participation does not in any  
6 way, shape or form federalize the MPA in any sense.  
7 Those MPAs would continue to be managed by the existing  
8 authorities and under the existing mandates that they  
9 are governed under right now.

10 So, there is an opportunity for -- and I'm  
11 thinking in the American Samoa case -- where there may  
12 be some co-management arrangements or communities have  
13 management authority for that level of participation.

14 On the international side of things, it did  
15 not come across strongly in this presentation, but  
16 there are some objectives underneath some of those  
17 goals that talk very specifically about international  
18 linkages. And when we talk about some of the regional  
19 processes for coordination and whatnot, international  
20 connections and linkages are spelled out very  
21 specifically and are very important components of this.

22 And, finally, on the evaluation side of

1 things, there was a bullet that we had in there about  
2 developing a set of performance measures. And we do  
3 have essentially -- I think you nailed it on the  
4 head -- is that we have a placeholder for that that  
5 identifies the importance for going back and developing  
6 those kinds of things.

7 But, again, I think we thought that it would  
8 be fairly presumptuous to put a set of indicators in  
9 place right now without having a sense of what the  
10 range of sites are that are going to be participating  
11 and without having those participants and provide input  
12 on what those indicators should be.

13 MR. PEAU: Could I make one more follow-up?  
14 At the regional level, do you have -- I guess, how do  
15 you define "region", the certain criteria for  
16 selection?

17 MR. KELSEY: This goes back to Tony's  
18 question. There isn't a definition. The definition of  
19 "region" right now is that, you know, it's sort of to  
20 be determined in some senses. It is to sit down with  
21 folks in a geographic area that are participating in  
22 the National System and see what is relevant and what

1 makes sense, because that could be different from what  
2 exists right now or it could be the same as what exists  
3 right now.

4 MR. PEAU: I think in that case, the second  
5 part of that: Is there an opportunity so that the  
6 community can be in two separate MPAs, if there is an  
7 opportunity, you know, commonalities, opportunity for  
8 networking? Is that something that --

9 MR. KELSEY: I think that is probably  
10 possible, yeah.

11 MR. PEAU: All right. Thank you.

12 MR. KELSEY: Brian?

13 MR. MELZIAN: Yes. Thank you. Brian Melzian,  
14 EPA.

15 Let me address some areas which may be of  
16 interest: One is the "region"; second, "Avoid Harm";  
17 thirdly, the process conducted to date to develop the  
18 current Framework document.

19 Regarding the regions, there have been  
20 discussions led by NOAA -- and I would like to  
21 acknowledge that -- with other federal agencies  
22 including EPA about some of the regions that could be

1 used. It could include biogeographical provinces. It  
2 could always be brought by (inaudible). It could  
3 include current nation bio(inaudible) appropriations,  
4 which you have regional areas based on biogeographical  
5 provinces.

6 The overlying flexibility in that Framework  
7 document is for the regions themselves to incorporate  
8 that.

9 Regarding the "Avoid Harm", since EPA  
10 specifically mentioned in the Executive Order about  
11 ocean dumping regulations and since our game is to  
12 protect the environment, EPA has had detailed  
13 communications and provided documents to NOAA regarding  
14 "Avoid Harm" a/k/a the Clean Water Act, for example,  
15 what is the balance due to its population, how is that  
16 impacted, Marine Protection Research and Sanctuaries  
17 Act a/k/a Ocean Dumping Act, irreparable harm or  
18 degradation; and, finally, the National Environmental  
19 Policy Act.

20 So there are existing statutes that are  
21 enforced by the federal agencies, EPA included, which  
22 go a long way to "Avoid Harm" and that includes the

1 entire marine environment and estuary environment and  
2 Great Lakes to 200 miles out.

3           Regarding the process of the Framework  
4 document, I listened to the presentation today and I  
5 just wanted to assure you that there actually is a  
6 document. It is quite lengthy. I have reviewed every  
7 word of that document for our agency. We reviewed it  
8 in detail including looking at things like: "Guess  
9 what? Executive Order says "sustainable use". It does  
10 not say "sustainable production" and where did that  
11 come from?"

12           There are other faults in earlier drafts, as  
13 Jonathan and Lauren knows, where I dug into the  
14 Regulations, the Executive Order, our document, the MPA  
15 document produced in June of last year, and found some  
16 inconsistencies that these -- "No, they did not cite  
17 that. They cited this."

18           I just wanted to assure you that the federal  
19 working group has met on several occasions, have  
20 provided formally written comments to MPA Center.

21           And as Jonathan and Joe knows, EPA tracks our  
22 comments like a hawk during the process of producing

1 the document. So, it is a NOAA-produced document, but  
2 it is not a NOAA sentry document.

3 So, it is very important to recognize that our  
4 agency -- and I searched out for comments from our own  
5 agency -- is that we are working collaboratively to  
6 produce it.

7 And then, finally, to back up this whole  
8 process, under NEPA and the Regulations, when we  
9 publish something in the Federal Register, right now  
10 this is still an open document. There will be plenty  
11 of opportunity for the public, MPA, Federal Advisory  
12 Committee, and my own agency to submit documents that  
13 later on we will have to actually have a response to  
14 ground this -- which Joe -- actually, I didn't have to  
15 acknowledge you -- a few weeks ago, they actually sent  
16 to the federal agencies the major concerns and issues  
17 that we had. Some of them were substantive, others  
18 were not; but they all were important. And MPA Center  
19 went point by point and listed what they did and how  
20 they tried to incorporate it.

21 So, speaking for my agency, we are very  
22 pleased with this process. It is not being ram-rodged

1 through the federal agency system. And there will be  
2 plenty of time for other groups, including this group,  
3 to respond to it. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes. Dan Bromley here. I  
5 appreciate both Tundi and Jim Ray bringing up the  
6 "Avoid Harm" thing.

7 I think in the Framework discussion, the  
8 reference back to the Executive Order, Section 5, is  
9 indeed very specific. There is a need for "lack of  
10 harm". Agencies may not, must not, should not do  
11 things.

12 But in all fairness to the record, when we  
13 moved forward to adopt our report in Portland, Maine,  
14 the concerns that came up about "Avoiding Harm" were of  
15 a very different nature.

16 They are, if you want, on page 4 of our  
17 report, the establishment of MPAs has some  
18 considerations and the objectives. And I invited you  
19 to look at paragraph E of the document which says:  
20 "Minimize, to the extent possible, adverse social and  
21 economic impacts on citizens and interest groups."

22 That was the "harm" discussion I believe we



1 had. Correct me if I'm wrong, but I think that was the  
2 substantive concern to very many people.

3 So, when we talk about things that were left  
4 on the table, as it were, it was not so much Section 5  
5 of the Executive Order as it was paragraph E under  
6 "Objectives".

7 And then in the Executive Order, if you look  
8 at Section 4, paragraph 7, that also is something that  
9 we must revisit, which is "Assessment of the economic  
10 effects of the preferred management solutions."

11 So, in picking up these issues that have been  
12 raised, we will need to keep working hard on what -- in  
13 a sense, we are talking about "harm" in two very  
14 different ways. And I know a number of the members of  
15 the committee do not wish for us to lose track of the  
16 other side of the equation which came up again in our  
17 deliberations in May of last year.

18 MS. WENZEL: This is Lauren Wenzel. I just  
19 wanted to point out that Fed Ex let us down and did not  
20 deliver some of our material. So, we do actually have  
21 extra copies of the FAC reports and background  
22 materials that did not arrive. So, hopefully, we will

1 have them later today.

2 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: What is Fed Ex -- something  
3 about "The world on time"? Not always.

4 MR. JORDAN: Not this time.

5 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Not this time. Exactly.

6 So, there is no response. I just thought I  
7 should throw that in there. We are kind of skirting  
8 around this deal about "Avoiding Harm". We will need  
9 to come to grips with it.

10 MR. KELSEY: Are there any other questions?

11 MR. LaPOINTE: Can we get a copy of your  
12 presentation at some point? That will help some of us.

13 MR. KELSEY: I believe we have that  
14 capability, yes. We can do that.

15 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Jonathan and Joe's  
16 presentation will be on the web site. Is that correct?

17 MR. KELSEY: Are you saying like today or  
18 tomorrow, before the meeting is over, or are you saying  
19 eventually, George?

20 MR. LaPOINTE: Eventually is fine.

21 MR. BENDICK: Bob Bendick. I do have one  
22 other question. In the report, it talks about the

1 financial assistance to MPAs. And is the direction of  
2 the proposal that you are drafting that financial  
3 assistance will come through the different programs of  
4 the different MPAs or is that there should or would be  
5 some sort of bonus or pool or other money for MPAs that  
6 were part of the National System?

7 MR. KELSEY: Well, that hits on a much larger  
8 issue than we can tackle in the Framework, obviously.  
9 That is an appropriations kind of issue and, you know,  
10 the ability of having the existence of a sort of legal  
11 mandate to allow those kinds of appropriations.

12 The way that things are framed in the  
13 Framework right now is that as participating sites and  
14 systems would sit down at a regional level and identify  
15 their priorities, their stewardship-type priorities  
16 that would require some kind of financial or technical  
17 or other kind of support, that it is incumbent on them  
18 and the MPA Center can help with their support to build  
19 partnerships to try and address those priorities that  
20 are established; but there is no formal mechanism  
21 outlined in the Framework which is a grant program or  
22 something along those lines that provides a bonus when

1     you sign on the dotted line. We just don't have that  
2     kind of authority or ability to make that kind of  
3     commitment.

4             So, it is more of an informal process at this  
5     point based on, you know, the Executive Order under  
6     which we are putting this Framework forward.

7             Lauren, did you have something?

8             MS. WENZEL: Yeah. I was just going to add  
9     that I think there is an opportunity for Subcommittee 2  
10    to look at this issue and to give us some more feedback  
11    on that.

12            MR. KELSEY: Bonnie?

13            VICE CHAIR McCAY: Speaking of incentives, I  
14    just looked at our report and I noted -- we are back to  
15    the "Avoid Harm" issue -- that at the very end you say  
16    that one of the incentives for participating in the  
17    National System, besides possible access to additional  
18    funding and other incentives, is that the MPAs that  
19    exist may get additional protection because of the  
20    federally required notifications, potential harmful  
21    actions, et cetera. So, this is already built into our  
22    report as one of the reasons for participating in a

1 National System.

2 MR. KELSEY: Sure. I think we have to  
3 critically think about what that "additional  
4 protection" means because, going back to what Joe says,  
5 is that under this Executive Order we are limited to  
6 the existing laws that are out there. And under "Avoid  
7 Harm", it is to the maximum extent practicable under  
8 those existing laws that are there.

9 So, we should be careful when we are talking  
10 and using words like "additional" because there are no  
11 new laws or new standards that we can bring to bear on  
12 these activities because we are confined to those  
13 authorities that already exist and the extent that  
14 agencies can use those authorities to look at their  
15 activities relative to resources that are protected by  
16 MPAs.

17 So, it provides an additional lens for looking  
18 at activities relative to MPA resources; but  
19 "additional protection" could be misconstrued a bit, I  
20 think.

21 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Are there other questions  
22 for Jonathan?

1 (No response.)

2 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. If not, we have a  
3 break. I want to ask two of our older members, if that  
4 is the right word, esteemed continuing members who came  
5 in late to introduce themselves. Actually, not an old  
6 member, just a senior member. I wouldn't dare call  
7 John Ogden old. Max, would you introduce yourself?

8 MR. PETERSON: I'm both old and continuous.

9 Anyway, I was a guest of American Airlines in  
10 Dallas last night because of the airplane thing.

11 Max Peterson. I'm a retired Executive Vice  
12 President of the International Association of Fish and  
13 Wildlife Agencies. A little further back, I was also  
14 Chief of Forest Service. So, I'm a "has been". Glad  
15 to be here.

16 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. Where is John Ogden?

17 DR. OGDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was  
18 attending a riotous retirement party -- and at my age,  
19 I can't afford to miss riotous parties.

20 Sorry I'm late. For those of you who are new,  
21 I'm Director of Florida's Institute of Oceanography in  
22 St. Petersburg.

1           CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: If you are looking for  
2 riotous parties, you have come to the right place.

3           We are going to start tonight. We don't wait  
4 until tomorrow. So, for the new members, you just  
5 check us out this evening -- if you can.

6           Okay. So, let's do our break. We are back on  
7 schedule at 10:30.

8           At 10:45, Mary Glackin will bring us up to  
9 speed on our new Charge.

10          So, our first official break is right on time.

11          (Brief recess: 10:31 a.m. - 10:52 a.m.)

12          CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Come to order. We are  
13 continuing with Mary Glackin, Ex-Officio from the  
14 Department of Commerce. She is going to talk with us  
15 about the Charge. And I see that the slide is up  
16 there. And then Joe will give us the priorities.

17          So, Mary, we have a half hour. We are very  
18 happy to have you with us. Thank you.

19          (Microphone adjustment.)

20          MS. GLACKIN: Okay. Well, thank you, Dan. I  
21 will take -- I have just a few slides to take us  
22 through here.

1           I thought I would abuse my privilege or my --  
2   the advantage of having a mike in my hand just to make  
3   a comment about this issue about "regional" that's been  
4   bouncing around here a little bit.

5           One of the other hats that I wear is I'm one  
6   of the Subcommittee Chairs for the subcommittee that  
7   was set up under the Ocean Action Plan called the  
8   "Subcommittee for Integrated Management of Ocean  
9   Resources". It is really that committee that is  
10  charged with helping us to move forward and next steps  
11  to an ecosystem approach to management. And as part of  
12  that process, we have been -- one of our main  
13  activities has been to support local and regional  
14  collaborations that are going forward. One of the  
15  prime ones was kicked off here a couple of weeks ago  
16  with the Gulf of Mexico Alliance.

17          I think the comment that I guess I want to  
18  make to you is that the whole approach of the Ocean  
19  Action Plan which we very much agree on is not having  
20  something that is federally prescribed put down, but  
21  really looking to foster collaborations that are coming  
22  up from the state and local level.



1           So, you know, I think a number of us have been  
2   thinking for some period of time: Well, there would be  
3   a map put out and we would divide the map up into  
4   different areas based on ecology or something else and  
5   get people together in a room around by the area and,  
6   you know, we would be off and moving forward.

7           And I guess what I want to say is that I think  
8   people are coming together in rooms, but they are  
9   coming together where the problems are bringing them  
10   together and they feel like they can make some  
11   activities.

12           So, I think this whole concept of "regional"  
13   we have to view as being opportunistic here, not as a  
14   very prescribed thing.

15           I, personally, find that challenging because  
16   I've got a background in physical sciences and I really  
17   like things laid out like that.

18           But just a little bit of -- I guess from the  
19   perspective of what we have been trying to do on the  
20   subcommittee called "See More" to move forward here.

21           And I do think these things are starting to  
22   happen. We have the New England Governors working now.

1 We have lots of activity on the West Coast. We have  
2 Alaska.

3 So, there are forums; but I think they are all  
4 going to be different, as they well should be given the  
5 different challenges that are there in areas.

6 So, when you come to something like a National  
7 Framework for MPAs, we are going to have to find ways  
8 to be able to adapt to these different forums and take  
9 advantage of that.

10 Okay. Now I'm going to turn to why they let  
11 me have the mike and I'm going to take you through the  
12 Charge, what we would like you to do.

13 In this case, I would draw your attention -- I  
14 obviously don't want you to stop now and read it; but  
15 in your packet, there is actually a two-page document,  
16 I guess it is three pages, that lays out the Charge to  
17 the Committee.

18 And I guess I would start by saying, you know:  
19 "If you do good work, you get given more work." And  
20 that is definitely the case that we are in. I think  
21 the other way you hear it said is: "If you want  
22 something done, you find busy people."

1           So, we have given you a little bit of a break,  
2       but we want to make you busy again -- and that is  
3       clearly because both the Department of Commerce and the  
4       Department of Interior are so pleased with the work  
5       we've had.

6           In fact, I was thinking as I was flying out  
7       here yesterday that both of the Ocean Commission  
8       Reports and also the Ocean Action Plan call us to bring  
9       people together of diverse views and interests and  
10      values and call us to try to find common ground and  
11      goals that are there. And that is something that this  
12      Committee in particular, I think, has really done and  
13      embodied in their work.

14          I was saying: "What a long way we have come  
15      from the first really memorable meeting at the Commerce  
16      Department several years ago and, you know, the kind of  
17      discussion that we can take on and where we are."

18          So, it is with that spirit and confidence that  
19      I lay this Charge out to you.

20          Okay. I have this in a couple of parts. This  
21      first part is the issues for kind of the full  
22      Committee. And we just spent time talking about the

1 National System Framework as was outlined by Joe and  
2 John. You will be seeing this, we hope, shortly. And  
3 at an individual level for individual members of the  
4 Committee, we are certainly looking for you to be  
5 commenting and responding on that.

6 But a unique role we feel that this Committee  
7 should play as a Committee is really providing advice  
8 on how we dialogue with our stakeholders. You know,  
9 really, the coming year will be very important for us  
10 in terms of the kind of engagements we have with our  
11 stakeholders, the kind of input they provide to us, how  
12 we respond to that kind of input.

13 It is really the idea that the process is  
14 almost as important and sometimes more important than  
15 the actual product in the end. And I think that is  
16 something that you are uniquely qualified to do.

17 The second area is the priorities for the  
18 system development within existing resources. And I  
19 think you know with the fiscal climate today in the  
20 country, in our area, nondiscretionary funding, we are  
21 certainly very challenged.

22 Joe is going to lay out, after I talk today

1 here, our thoughts on priorities for this development.  
2 And it is something that we certainly believe we can  
3 benefit from your council and input a lot.

4 So, in both of these, we are viewing that  
5 largely the products of the Committee would be the  
6 dialogue that we get, but does not preclude us getting  
7 something else from you; but we feel that we can really  
8 benefit kind of in real time from feedback from you as  
9 we move forward in this area.

10 Now, no surprise, because we have been talking  
11 about it in conference calls for a number of months  
12 now, there's several areas that we feel need some  
13 specific attention and indeed you guys have aligned  
14 yourself to subcommittees on -- and the backup papers  
15 speak more specifically to this.

16 The first one is this area of regional  
17 priorities for conservation and really identifies the  
18 challenge of how we coordinate National System planning  
19 with its various ecosystem approaches to management  
20 that are going on in various ways and addressing some  
21 of the issues that are laid out here or challenges, you  
22 know, guidelines for the planning process to develop

1 new or enhanced conservation, working with existing  
2 regional bodies that are often varied and different, as  
3 I mentioned before, with the idea of being able to  
4 integrate across the three themes that we have laid  
5 out.

6 I think Subcommittee 1 is really challenged  
7 and, you know, has some really challenging tasks in  
8 front of it to take this on.

9 Subcommittee 2 we are asking to look at this  
10 area, as we were talking about right before break, of  
11 incentives and implementation because we recognize  
12 there is more work that has to be done here. And the  
13 question really kind of taking on is, you know: How  
14 can we assure the National System adds values to  
15 efforts that are already there?

16 This issue of costs and benefits of what we  
17 are doing, that is going to be very important in the  
18 federal budget process, is being able to demonstrate,  
19 you know, particularly if there is a need to make a  
20 case for more resources, what is really going to be the  
21 benefit of doing that? Why do we have to change the  
22 world that we have? If we have thousands of marine

1 managed sites now, isn't that just good enough and go  
2 on? So that will be an important part of this.

3 This issue of effectiveness, Lelei mentioned  
4 the evaluation here to meet national goals is part of  
5 this, and then the area of incentives, monetary and  
6 nonmonetary incentives.

7 And then Subcommittee 3, we are calling for  
8 some more attention to the natural and social sciences  
9 and trying to address what should be the common science  
10 needs between a National System of MPAs and already  
11 what we are trying to take on in various forms of  
12 ecosystems approach to management.

13 So, the kind of issues here are: What key  
14 information needs are there; sharing of new methods,  
15 tools and information; the design for multiple  
16 conservation goals and issues of resiliency and use and  
17 value of resources.

18 So, I think you will agree that all three of  
19 these areas are pretty challenging.

20 We haven't prescribed exactly how to do this  
21 and I think that is one of the things I'm suspecting  
22 will come out of the discussions here is, whether these

1 efforts are documented in one report or a series of  
2 reports, we have laid out work that we feel is  
3 something reasonable to kind of take on between now and  
4 October of 2007. And I think that, you know, the kind  
5 of packaging and what this shapes up to be, we are open  
6 to suggestions back.

7 So I will stop with that. And, Dan, I'm happy  
8 to take questions from the group or entertain  
9 discussion.

10 (No response.)

11 MS. GLACKIN: Overwhelmed. They are  
12 overwhelmed.

13 Yes, John?

14 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Introduce yourself first.

15 DR. OGDEN: John Ogden. You prefaced your  
16 talk based on the handout with a remark about how you  
17 would really like to see this, you know, the national  
18 network be developed in a rational systematic way, but  
19 you saw that it actually, in your opinion, really is  
20 going to be much more opportunistic; and, yet, if I  
21 look at the way you -- this is -- you know, "inventory"  
22 and "regional areas", it is, in fact, laid out as if



1     you really are -- and I think we should -- be more  
2     systematic about this, recognizing that individual MPAs  
3     that rise up to join the network are going to be very  
4     much locally driven.

5             You know, I am just having difficulty  
6     reconciling what you said with what you actually  
7     presented.

8             MS. GLACKIN: I think what I was referring to  
9     is that I wanted to go back to the whole Ocean Policy  
10    Commission Report. And a draft of that report, which I  
11    think many people saw, that went to the Governors  
12    really laid out, you know, quite a bit of regional  
13    structure for how we should move forward with respect  
14    to ocean management and ocean science.

15            And the Final Report and the President's Ocean  
16    Action Plan did not go down that route. It basically  
17    said, you know: "We are going to support the States as  
18    they want to move forward with these kinds of issues."

19            So, I think the challenge or the nexus here is  
20    that there is not -- I don't believe that there will be  
21    any consistent regional entities, you know, from region  
22    to region, that we will just be able to hook into; but

1 I think there will be different entities and types of  
2 entities there. In some cases, it may be states,  
3 tribal units. In some cases, you may have regional  
4 alliances that come together to engage with.

5 Does that help?

6 DR. OGDEN: Yeah. I guess that -- I suppose I  
7 will point out that one of the regional alliances is  
8 right here in the Gulf and it was launched by the  
9 Governors of five gulf states and it includes Mexico --  
10 and as of yet, not Cuba; but that is an oversight that  
11 will be corrected sometime in the future.

12 But at any rate, you know, I think that those  
13 of us who are participating in those discussions within  
14 the Gulf are essentially looking at a more systematic  
15 approach. And I have always had the impression the  
16 Gulf of Maine was moving in that direction and  
17 California was moving sort of in that direction.

18 So, anyway, I don't want to belabor this; but  
19 I think -- I suppose you are right -- it is sort of  
20 going to be "What happens happens" rather than being  
21 driven from the top.

22 MS. GLACKIN: That is right. And that is the

1 main point I was conveying.

2 MR. PETERSON: Mary, Max Peterson. Let me  
3 suggest that I like the idea that we let some of these  
4 evolve so we can learn something from them.

5 As scientists, we like to talk about  
6 bioregions, biophysical provinces; but unless some  
7 proposed region has political support, it won't  
8 succeed. So, political support does not necessarily  
9 follow biogeographic regions.

10 And let me suggest, too, that I'm getting a  
11 little concerned that we are trying to write too much.

12 It seems to me the Framework document is short  
13 enough so it can be read.

14 I don't think it is any accident that there is  
15 only Ten Commandments and that we wrote the Declaration  
16 of Independence in three pages and the U.S.  
17 Constitution is only, in print, five or six pages.

18 So, I would suggest we resist the idea to try  
19 to define everything and try to completely nail it down  
20 because this is, in fact, a learning process.

21 And unless people five years from now decide a  
22 Marine Protected Area is a good idea, they won't get

1 financial support, they won't get financial support,  
2 and they will dry up on the vine.

3 So, I think it is more important that the job  
4 be done right than it be done quickly and that it be  
5 done comprehensively.

6 "Comprehensively" and "quickly" does not  
7 necessarily mean "permanent".

8 So, I'm somebody who has seen efforts that got  
9 started and blew up great big and developed huge  
10 reports that ended up on a bookcase that nobody ever  
11 looked at again.

12 So, that is just a little realism thought.  
13 Thank you.

14 MS. GLACKIN: Here, here.

15 DR. HEINEMANN: Dennis Heinemann. Question  
16 about sort of a difference, perhaps, between what you  
17 just presented and what John presented earlier.

18 I noticed when John went through the Framework  
19 that he spoke about the benefits of a published system  
20 of MPAs. I didn't catch anything about cost, but it is  
21 there in your presentation in the "Incentive and  
22 Implementation" section there.

1           And I'm wondering -- maybe John can answer  
2       this -- whether or not the Framework as it is now  
3       addresses costs of the network?

4           MR. KELSEY: Joe? I mean I think I know the  
5       simple answer.

6           MR. URAVITCH: Joe Uravitch. No, there are no  
7       specifics on costs within the Framework because what it  
8       is going to cost depends on what directions we go. So,  
9       obviously, we are looking at scenarios of what you  
10      might do; but the Framework, itself, does not have  
11      specific costs identified at this time.

12          MR. BENDICK: At the risk of being repetitive,  
13      I think your presentation, Mary, recycles the questions  
14      that I had after Jonathan's presentation, which are:

15          We have been talking about an Inventory of all  
16      sorts of Marine Protected Areas representing all kinds  
17      of standards and institutions around the country, we  
18      are talking about a very different thing than something  
19      that is a product of thoughtful discussion in the  
20      region which could attract some incentives and which  
21      together on a scientific or political basis represented  
22      the marine heritage of the U.S., a kind of "safety

1 net", which is a term we used earlier on in our  
2 discussions, for both the biological, cultural and  
3 productive heritage of the country.

4 And in the work of the Subcommittees, it seems  
5 to me that thinking about a regional structure implies  
6 some sort of selectivity of the places that would be  
7 part of the safety net.

8 In thinking about incentives, you can't really  
9 apply incentives to thousands of different kinds of  
10 sites, but only certain kinds of sites that are  
11 cornerstones of an overall system.

12 And even the science, if everybody's  
13 science -- or everybody's idea of what a Marine  
14 Protected Area is okay, then science deciding in many  
15 different ways what is part of the safety net is not as  
16 relevant.

17 So, I mean your presentation speaks to me as  
18 more of a framework, of refining the framework which I  
19 think this Committee originally envisioned of a system  
20 that did serve and protect the nation's marine  
21 resources as opposed to the -- and I'm sorry to talk  
22 for so long -- the kind of Inventory that Jonathan

1 presented that seems to be emerging from the report  
2 that we have not seen yet.

3 MS. GLACKIN: Yeah. Joe, do you -- I'm not  
4 sure what --

5 MR. URAVITCH: Yeah. Joe Uravitch. Yeah, I  
6 will take that on.

7 The Framework is really laying out the process  
8 for moving into the future. That Inventory and the  
9 initial National System based on existing sites is  
10 basically your Stage 1. Because we already have sites  
11 out there and there are things that can be done with  
12 those that can help advance things forward.

13 The next step, though, is on a regional basis  
14 to move forward with what additional things need to be  
15 done, whether it means -- well, first of all,  
16 identifying what the priorities are; but, then, whether  
17 those could be resolved through existing sites,  
18 enhancement of existing sites or new sites -- a sort of  
19 gap analysis.

20 We are actually testing some of this  
21 methodology out on the West Coast with what we are  
22 calling the "West Coast Pilot", in which we are looking

1 at natural resource characterization, cultural resource  
2 characterization, human use and impact work, as well as  
3 an analysis of the Inventory, which will help advance  
4 the whole system further down the road. And we have  
5 already started doing that in cooperation with both  
6 NOS's Centers for Coastal Ocean Science and the  
7 National Marine Sanctuary Program, hopefully expanding  
8 into other partners.

9 So, it is both. Okay? We are starting with  
10 what we've got because it is there, they are doing  
11 something, and we hope we can help them do it better;  
12 but then there is the future down the road -- which I  
13 think is what you are talking about, if I understand  
14 that correctly, Bob.

15 MR. BENDICK: I guess I would just suggest  
16 that something like the West Coast Experimental, the  
17 Governors Alliance for the Gulf of Mexico and the Gulf  
18 of Maine Alliance, you don't have to necessarily have a  
19 standardized regional framework to make progress within  
20 a larger framework that we are talking about. So, I  
21 don't know if that should hold us up. These things are  
22 bubbling up from the bottom already by themselves



1 because I think there is a public perception of need  
2 here.

3 MR. URAVITCH: Right. And we agree completely  
4 and that is why we are not being proscriptive on what  
5 "regions" means, because there are all of these  
6 regional initiatives bubbling up or some have been in  
7 place for years and we want to make sure we are working  
8 with those groups that are already moving forward in  
9 regions and make sure that what we are doing can fit in  
10 with what they are doing or figure out how to do that.

11 MS. GLACKIN: Any more questions?

12 MR. URAVITCH: Any more questions for Mary?

13 MS. GLACKIN: That Joe can answer.

14 MR. GILMAN: I'm curious where the date of  
15 "October 2007" came from.

16 MS. GLACKIN: Lauren has that answer.

17 MS. WENZEL: That came from the fact that half  
18 the Committee will cycle off at the end of 2007.

19 MS. GLACKIN: Bonnie, did you have a question?

20 VICE CHAIR McCAY: My question was very  
21 similar. I guess it was more of an expression. Mary,  
22 I would like to know how you think we can accomplish

1     that given after this meeting and perhaps no other --  
2     one more --

3             MS. WENZEL:   Two more?

4             CHAIRMAN BROMLEY:   2007.

5             DR. BONNIE McCAY:   2007.   I'm sorry.   I'm  
6     leaping ahead here.   Forgive me.

7             MS. GLACKIN:   Yeah.   I was going to say:   The  
8     first thing, too, you know, we did try to match up, you  
9     know, the work with the time period that was there.  
10    And I think that, you know, that can be something that  
11    is part of the discussion, too.   Because these  
12    things -- I think you will agree -- even in a  
13    couple-page sheet here are not terribly prescriptive,  
14    you know, in terms of how -- you know, what the end  
15    product might look like.   Dan?

16            VICE CHAIR McCAY:   Mary, could I follow this  
17    up and ask you to give us some advice about what --  
18    let's say each Subcommittee provides a report based  
19    upon its Charge.   What would be most effective?   What  
20    kinds of documents or products would actually be most  
21    effective given, you know, the positions of the  
22    agencies and what the locals may want to do?

1 MS. GLACKIN: Well, I don't think I have a  
2 clear picture of that right now. I mean I think that  
3 one of the things I was hoping would come out of the  
4 Subcommittee discussions today is a bit more than I  
5 think the Subcommittees have been able to do to date in  
6 terms of what an approach and kind of a work plan for  
7 that might be.

8 I mean I guess I would like to see input in  
9 some kind of measured fashion along the way as opposed  
10 to waiting until October 2007; but I'm open to other  
11 thoughts, depending on the work.

12 (Addressing Mr. Uravitch) Did you --

13 MR. URAVITCH: No.

14 MS. GLACKIN: Dan, did you want to comment on  
15 this one as well?

16 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: I just wanted to say that  
17 this discussion, it is useful. We will go over it  
18 again. We will have some ideas for you just before  
19 lunch when we sort of turn you loose in your  
20 Subcommittees.

21 So, this is wonderful, Mary, to hear this; but  
22 we, as a group, will have to sort of work out what it

1 is we intend to do. I'm really happy to hear you just  
2 say that "Wouldn't it be nice if there are some things  
3 coming along rather than waiting until the end."

4 Whether we are able to do that with no budget  
5 for other meetings, we are not sure yet, Mary; but  
6 that's --

7 Will you be with us all day today and  
8 tomorrow?

9 MS. GLACKIN: All day and most of tomorrow. I  
10 flying out at the end of tomorrow.

11 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Because we are going  
12 to have the Subcommittees report back to us what they  
13 intend to do after they have met initially, and that  
14 would be wonderful then to have you here and tell us if  
15 you think we are on the right track.

16 MS. GLACKIN: Great. Okay. Are we ready to  
17 hear -- Oh, there's one more. All right.

18 MR. GILMAN: My follow-up on a question was  
19 whether our time line was going to fit well with that  
20 of the MPA Center's. I don't really have a good feel  
21 for when, what their schedule is like, when they are  
22 planning on identifying MPAs and starting the process

1 as to the regions that establish the system and start  
2 to implement it.

3 MS. GLACKIN: Will you address that?

4 MR. URAVITCH: Yeah.

5 MS. GLACKIN: Yeah, that is part of what Joe  
6 will be covering.

7 MR. URAVITCH: What I would say is that this  
8 is going to influence the process as we move forward.  
9 I mean the Framework is going to go out for public  
10 comment. It will be out for several months for review.  
11 We will continue to refine what an MPA means and  
12 identify the National System.

13 But meanwhile, what we are looking for is more  
14 detail on "Okay. What is important?" "How do we do  
15 this?" "How do we proceed with certain aspects of  
16 this," which is why it was broken down into the three  
17 Subcommittees relating to how we function at a regional  
18 level, because that is going to come at the end.

19 Our intent is to establish this initial system  
20 based on existing sites by October 2007. That has been  
21 in the long-term plan. But once you get there, then  
22 what do you do?

1           I mean that is part of what we are asking you  
2   to help us think through. How do you implement that  
3   system at a regional level? What kind of incentives  
4   are needed to make this happen? What kind of science  
5   is necessary to really support that as well as to move  
6   forward into the future into that larger system that  
7   Bob was talking about earlier.

8           So, I think this actually fits in with the  
9   processes. We are moving forward to define the  
10   operational system itself. We will be getting ideas  
11   from you on how we move forward with the operations  
12   when the time comes.

13           Any additional questions for Mary?

14           (No audible response.)

15           MR. URAVITCH: Okay. All right. Then I will  
16   move to the practical and the reality in terms of what  
17   resources we do have available to move forward and what  
18   the priorities are for the MPA Center in terms of  
19   making that happen -- if I can find my presentation.

20           (Perused document.)

21           So, basically, I'm going to do this sort of  
22   "practically speaking" here. As we all know, money

1 drives many things; and, so, we wanted to lay out for  
2 you the priorities for us in our operating year, this  
3 current fiscal year 2006, as well as where we are going  
4 since we do hope for some practicality at least in the  
5 short term.

6 Let's see. Hit the right button here. There  
7 we go.

8 So, I am going to cover just very quickly --  
9 for the new members in particular, so you know where we  
10 come from -- the budget history for the MPA Center.

11 For those new members, "Marine Protected  
12 Areas" is actually a line item in the "NOAA Ocean and  
13 Coastal Management Budget," so we exist as a program in  
14 the NOAA Budget.

15 I'm going to discuss our organizational  
16 capabilities, where we have been, what we have been  
17 doing and sort of where we are now, both under the '06  
18 appropriation as well as what could happen in 2007  
19 based on the President's Request.

20 I'm sorry we don't have the handouts. Thank  
21 you, Fed Ex. There's a lot of details in here that you  
22 can't see.

1 But, basically, what this lays out on the  
2 horizontal column on the left are the goals of the MPA  
3 Center based on the Executive Order, which is to  
4 develop the Framework for the National System; to  
5 facilitate regional, national and international MPA  
6 coordination; and, third, to improve MPA stewardship  
7 and effectiveness.

8 In 2002 to 2004, we were moving along on all  
9 of those three tracks when we took a budget cut. And  
10 the numbers will be on the next slide.

11 In 2005, we basically suspended the work of  
12 the Technical and Training Institute down in  
13 Charleston, South Carolina.

14 In 2006, we took an unexpected hit in our  
15 budget and came forward with an appropriation of only  
16 \$1 million-and-a-half. The President requested \$2.8.

17 So that forced us to really start thinking  
18 about highest priorities and we reduced a significant  
19 amount of work.

20 (Commotion in the audience.)

21 MR. URAVITCH: It's too early for this.

22 So, basically, in 2006 -- and I'll get to the



1 details -- we focused in on our highest priority work  
2 in terms of developing the framework and facilitating  
3 some regional work as well as some national and  
4 international work.

5 We dropped, for example, our Pacific Islands  
6 Coordinator, our Education Coordinator. We had to  
7 phase out a number of activities including, for  
8 example, support for the Advisory Committee  
9 Subcommittees.

10 And for the most part, we have suspended our  
11 work on MPA stewardship and effectiveness improvements  
12 in lieu of trying to get the Framework for the National  
13 System up and focusing on things like our West Coast  
14 Pilot.

15 In 2007, a lot really depends on  
16 appropriations. We have an Increase Request from the  
17 administration up from the \$1 million-and-a-half to  
18 \$2.15, which will allow us to move forward with some  
19 priority work, but we are obviously going to have to  
20 make further reductions in 2007 if the budget goes  
21 forward as it is proposed.

22 Just a quick view of where we were. The

1 President has requested routinely about \$3 million a  
2 year.

3 In 2006, it went down to \$2.8 as a result of a  
4 series of recisions that came down from the Congress.

5 Congress actually appropriated only \$1  
6 million-and-a-half in 2006, which forced us basically  
7 to do some major readjustments in our funding.

8 We are not in as bad of shape as we could have  
9 been because, as you can see, we had congressional  
10 add-on's in 2003 and 2004 and we basically spread those  
11 costs out over the past couple of operating years.

12 So you have seen us performing at a certain  
13 level of work and we had intended to do that as well  
14 this year until we got that unexpected reduction well  
15 below the President's Request.

16 The Request for the new budget is for \$2.15  
17 million, so we are moving back in a positive direction  
18 in terms of appropriations; but that, obviously, is  
19 still going to limit the amount of work we are going to  
20 do.

21 Very quickly, what we are focused on this year  
22 is development of the Framework and support of the

1 public review process.

2           What has had to go is the amount of  
3 post-publication meetings. That we set aside a little  
4 bit of money to do that, but we are fairly limited  
5 between now and October 1st in terms of how many public  
6 meetings we can support after the Framework is out for  
7 review; but we will, of course, continue to attend as  
8 many meetings of organizations, institutions and  
9 agencies as we can to make sure that we do get the  
10 opportunity for feedback.

11           We are focusing very heavily on the supporting  
12 science, which is really foundational for where we are  
13 going forward, through the MPA West Coast Pilot, which  
14 I mentioned earlier, which, in addition to the natural,  
15 social and cultural science work, the inventory work  
16 also has a government side to it, understanding the  
17 institutional structures that exist -- you could call  
18 that "social science" as well -- but also bringing the  
19 agencies together at the regional level, testing this  
20 out, developing the methodology in Oregon, Washington,  
21 California.

22           We are also continuing at a reduced level from

1 last year some very targeted science and technical  
2 projects we have been working on. These included  
3 things like the benthic-pelagic study we have been  
4 working on with fisheries and recreational fishing  
5 communities.

6 Obviously, there's support of this committee,  
7 though we don't have the resources for the  
8 subcommittees to meet this year, as well as the web  
9 site updates.

10 Just a quick summary here. This is our 2006  
11 operations.

12 The darker green really is where, in 2006, the  
13 smaller column, this is where we thought we would be in  
14 terms of moving forward with the budget.

15 Those sort of olive green -- they are supposed  
16 to be yellow, the old caution sign -- where we have  
17 worked at a reduced rate.

18 And those things that look sort of brown are  
19 where we are basically doing meetings, but we are not  
20 really doing a lot of support financially beyond that.

21 The right-hand column is the \$1.5. That is  
22 the reality that we are dealing with.

1           As you can see, the only bright green there is  
2 working on this Framework document. That is because  
3 that is primarily Jonathan doing the work on that and  
4 supporting the interagency meetings and the rest of us  
5 helping with supporting on public review.

6           National System Development Planning, we have  
7 lost some of our analysts out of the West Coast, so  
8 there is a limitation to what we can do with that and  
9 with the Inventory.

10           And we are basically cutting back on regional  
11 coordination other than the West Coast.

12           If you look at New England, basically we've  
13 got -- we still have Kate Smuchler, our Regional  
14 Coordinator in New England, but we don't really have  
15 the resources to put into workshop and some of the  
16 other activities that we had intended to do.

17           In the other regions, basically the  
18 coordination work there is through our headquarter  
19 staff to the degree we could move forward with that.

20           The Advisory Committee is in that sort of tan  
21 instead of yellow, because we don't have the resources  
22 for the subcommittees this year in terms of travel

1 support for the subcommittees, unfortunately.

2 So that is pretty much where we are this year.

3 Next year, the President's Request, as I said,  
4 is an increase over what Congress appropriated. We  
5 will basically focus on responding to comments on the  
6 draft Framework and completing that. We would be able  
7 to establish the National System based on existing  
8 sites with the intention of moving beyond that.

9 We will have to cut back on the work we are  
10 doing on our West Coast Pilot -- and I will get into  
11 that briefly.

12 We are going to have to phase down our  
13 targeted science work.

14 The Advisory Committee would be at two  
15 meetings per year as established and we will maintain  
16 our MPA.gov web site, which is obviously critical.

17 So, if we get the President's Request, that is  
18 the large column.

19 In the middle, you can see we are in that sort  
20 of yellowish phase for the National System.

21 The West Coast Pilot, you see those question  
22 marks there because at \$2.15 something is going to have

1 to go in terms of some of our staff that are focused on  
2 West Coast Pilot Projects. And we haven't made those  
3 determinations of where those reductions would be made;  
4 but we are going to have to either cut back on the  
5 coordination side, natural science, social science or  
6 cultural science. I mean that is the choice we've got  
7 under those resources.

8 We would have to phase out our New England  
9 Coordinator as of October 1st.

10 And the Advisory Committee would continue at  
11 its current rate. We'd keep the web site going because  
12 that is a major source of public information and we  
13 will continue to do as much as we can on communication  
14 and outreach.

15 On the targeted science, basically we would  
16 continue to focus on the benthic-pelagic compatibility  
17 work we are doing with the recreational fishing  
18 community. That is dealing a lot in terms of  
19 understanding, and then moving ahead on that issue.

20 But we will have to probably drop attending  
21 meetings as opposed to helping support those  
22 partnerships, the fisheries MPA integration work, the

1 developing monitoring work, drop the activities work we  
2 are doing with the Park Service down at the Caribbean  
3 and start to phase out our navigating MPAs work, which  
4 is work with Coast Pilot and the NOAA charting boats  
5 and start putting the inventory information into Coast  
6 Pilot and other NOAA navigation documents.

7 Education, that was phased out a couple of  
8 years ago.

9 International Efforts, we will continue to  
10 support at least attending the meetings of North  
11 American MPA Network, for which I'm the U.S.  
12 Representative, as well as some other work going on.

13 And there is a question as to whether we will  
14 be able to sustain our West Coast office at this point.  
15 Obviously, we think we need to do that. Because we are  
16 doing the West Coast Pilot, we sort of want people on  
17 the West Coast; but there is a big expense there just  
18 in terms of the facilities.

19 If we get level funding, then we've got a  
20 pretty serious situation at \$1.5 and that is something  
21 that we are going to have to think about.

22 And, so, I hate to be glooming and dooming,



1 because we are moving forward, we have set priorities,  
2 and we are going to do the best we can.

3 And now I will leave it open for questions.

4 Yes, Tony.

5 DR. CHATWIN: Tony Chatwin. Just a clarifying  
6 question. If you should get level funding, there was a  
7 red for the Federal Advisory Committee. What does that  
8 mean?

9 MR. URAVITCH: Uh...

10 What it means is that we probably would not  
11 have money to support the full committee or we would  
12 have to get rid of another staff member.

13 So, \$1.5, sort of you are starting to run on  
14 empty. And it is going to be the choice between  
15 whether we get rid of two people or we continue with  
16 the Committee or when we reappoint a new Committee that  
17 it is reduced in size.

18 Maybe we go down from 30 members to 20 or 15.  
19 When we go through the cycle and have to do  
20 reappointments, we may have to look at the Charter and  
21 reduce the size of the Committee in order to keep it  
22 moving forward.

1 Other questions, please?

2 Yes, Dan? Dan Suman.

3 DR. SUMAN: Is there any possibility of the  
4 Department of the Interior increasing participation,  
5 financial participation and contribution for the NOI?

6 MR. URAVITCH: I will turn that over to our  
7 colleague, Randy Bowman, from the Interior.

8 MR. BOWMAN: In a nutshell, no.

9 The Executive Order placed the incentives with  
10 Congress to make that relief on funding at this time.

11 We are facing the same type of financial  
12 situation. Congress is not picking on the Commerce  
13 Department or the MPAs.

14 So, it's just not realistic. We are looking  
15 at probably a ten percent staffing reduction at least  
16 at the Washington office across the board next year.

17 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Will you speak up into the  
18 microphone, please?

19 MR. BOWMAN: Anyway, the answer is, in a  
20 nutshell, is that we are facing the same type of  
21 restrictions on all the Interior agencies.

22 MR. URAVITCH: Yes, Tundi?

1 DR. AGARDY: Joe, I am sure within NOAA you  
2 have looked at what happened and tried to evaluate why  
3 it happened. I understand there are budget cuts across  
4 the board for all kinds of resource management  
5 agencies.

6 But I wonder if this Committee actually has  
7 not been too kind of soft-peddling the MPA System idea.  
8 And, you know, in the attempt to try to make it  
9 realistic and practicable and take wise guidance into  
10 account and say "Some things need to evolve and grow,"  
11 we haven't been very forceful about really, I think,  
12 the common vision that we had, which is that this is  
13 needed for the country and without it we miss  
14 opportunities.

15 So, I wonder if you could actually maybe just  
16 describe why you think this happened and whether we  
17 need to be a little bit more forceful about promoting  
18 the idea of a National System in order to secure  
19 funding into the future.

20 MR. URAVITCH: In regards to our current  
21 appropriation of \$1 million-and-a-half, no one is quite  
22 sure of what happened there.

1           It went into Conference Committee with the  
2   President's number or better from the House and Senate;  
3   but our program, like a number of NOAA programs, came  
4   out of Conference Committee with less than either House  
5   or Senate went in with.

6           So, I think it was really part of looking for  
7   money in a challenging budget year at the congressional  
8   level.

9           I think what 2007 says from the  
10   Administration's perspective is that, you know, if they  
11   did not want us to move forward, they wouldn't have  
12   given us an increase. The easiest thing would have  
13   been to say: "Okay. It's \$1 million-and-a-half.  
14   Let's leave it at \$1 million-and-a-half because we can  
15   play with our numbers elsewhere."

16           So, I think the fact that we have an increase  
17   proposal, even if it doesn't get us back to where we  
18   were, is a positive statement that there is a desire  
19   for us to move forward.

20           Max, you look like you have a question. Max  
21   Peterson.

22           MR. PETERSON: I think that Tundi's got a good

1 point, though. I think that part of the reason it  
2 probably got cut is business and it didn't have a  
3 champion on the Hill. And when you have a real bad  
4 budget year, if there is nobody on the Conference  
5 Committee that even knows what this is about or knows  
6 what the benefits are, it is likely to get whacked.

7 So, I think we need to think about -- we  
8 cannot do something as a Committee because we would get  
9 in trouble for using appropriated funds to lobby or  
10 something.

11 But I think, as individuals on this Committee,  
12 we might think about what we can do. That means we  
13 need to think about -- I think there are some  
14 opportunities actually to use resources more  
15 effectively for cooperation at a regional level, for  
16 example.

17 So, I think there are some potentially  
18 identifiable benefits and I suggest that some of us  
19 work on a statement that could be given that would  
20 support this and see if we can find a champion.  
21 Because if we don't, this is a new program without any  
22 champions and it is likely to get whacked back to where

1 it was and not get an increase in additional funds.

2 MR. URAVITCH: John Ogden.

3 DR. OGDEN: I would like to second that, what  
4 Max just said.

5 I was just recalling as he was talking that I  
6 used to run the Hydrolab program for NOAA in St. Croix  
7 and it was the biggest contract in our university under  
8 Lowell Whikeran. And he used to say time and time  
9 again: "There is no general constituency for the  
10 oceans in the United States." In fact, it was he and  
11 Hollings -- and now they are both gone, of course. And  
12 now we are left with regional constituents, regional  
13 people with regional interests, but no one who sort of  
14 takes a much broader view.

15 And, boy, if we could find -- Max just said  
16 "Find that champion" -- I think we could exert  
17 ourselves to try to develop that champion. Don't you,  
18 Max?

19 MR. PETERSON: Yeah, I think we could. We  
20 might need to look at some of the ongoing efforts like  
21 what George Lapointe's crew has done in Maine and  
22 what's being done down in Florida and some other

1 places, where we can say: "Here is some tangible  
2 evidence that this makes sense." Because unless we  
3 have that, we won't prevail.

4 MR. URAVITCH: Any other questions or  
5 comments?

6 Yes, Steve. Steve Murray.

7 DR. MURRAY: I think one of the real  
8 fundamental issues for us is how we and our group and  
9 the MPA Center, I guess, how we can maximize our impact  
10 under the circumstances.

11 And I guess I bring this up because one of the  
12 issues of concern for me is that we don't wind up going  
13 through all these years -- we have been through three  
14 literally now, two and one break year -- with simply a  
15 structure that just throws a whole bunch of regional  
16 things in it and provides no real essence of leadership  
17 with regard to developing some kind of a National  
18 System.

19 I think that our efforts over the last two  
20 years were geared towards providing something that was  
21 going to make a difference in some way rather than  
22 something that wasn't. And if we look at how this can

1 play out, it can play out in a way that simply provides  
2 some bag or structure or repository within which things  
3 get filed, but without doing anything of a real  
4 difference-making way. And I say that, you know, fully  
5 recognizing the issues at the regional level versus the  
6 national level.

7 MR. URAVITCH: Yeah. And I think there are  
8 some good examples of that going on, particularly on  
9 the West Coast where we have been focusing. If you  
10 look at the work in Oregon, Washington, California,  
11 that Charlie and his folks have started now in this  
12 West Coast Pilot Project, we have had the ability to  
13 bring in the Sanctuary Program, NOAA NOS's Coastal  
14 Ocean Science Centers, we are going to be bringing in  
15 the States as well as the Park Service and Fish &  
16 Wildlife and the databases of various agencies that are  
17 out there, National Marine Fishery Service, to really  
18 move this thing forward.

19 And that is part of our function is to be a  
20 catalyst and hopefully get enough resources to make  
21 this thing happen.

22 We are doing something similar with the North



1 American MPA Network, the Commission for Environmental  
2 Cooperation, in which we have managed to get our  
3 counterparts of Mexico and Canada to agree that really  
4 what needs to be done is to get down to the sites, to  
5 get them actually doing something.

6 And we met a couple of months ago in Santa  
7 Barbara, led by Gary Davis from the Park Service, to  
8 agree that monitoring, using MPAs for monitoring up and  
9 down the West Coast was critical -- and this is Baja to  
10 Bering -- and we managed to convince the CDC to put  
11 \$110,000 of their money into this for the next year to  
12 start making this kind of thing operational. And that  
13 is where we can make a difference in this sort of  
14 thing.

15 Yes, Mike?

16 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. We have time for one  
17 or two more questions and then we need to move on.  
18 Mike?

19 DR. CRUICKSHANK: Is there any way at all to  
20 tie this into (inaudible.) There are many MPAs  
21 worldwide. (Inaudible.)

22 MR. URAVITCH: That is certainly one of our

1 visions is to try and reach out to all the programs  
2 that are available. That is one reason why we have  
3 this federal interagency working group which includes,  
4 besides the management agencies, agencies such as State  
5 Department and National Science Foundation.

6 So, you know, we are out there to partner with  
7 whoever we can find. We just have to agree that there  
8 is some mutual benefit to moving forward on that and  
9 make sure we get that message out there. So, we are  
10 working on it.

11 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. One more question.  
12 John.

13 MR. URAVITCH: Yes, John Halsey.

14 DR. HALSEY: John Halsey. I have some real  
15 concerns that, well, first of all, what you are  
16 predicting -- or not "predicting" -- but laying out for  
17 us as the financial future really, I think, makes it a  
18 priority that this Committee come up with something  
19 that can stand as some sort of a real document.  
20 Because I have a bad feeling that if you reduce this  
21 Committee by a third and it is all or mostly new  
22 people, I can't see something good coming out of that.

1           CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Sorry, Joe. I don't know  
2 if you want to answer; but I want to terminate all this  
3 lamentation that is going around.

4           I can't stand to start two-and-a-half days  
5 more of meetings with everybody being soured on what we  
6 are going to do. So, can we --

7           Joe, if you want to respond, that's fine; but  
8 this is not a good way to end before lunch.

9           So, I have a pep talk and I want to give it.  
10 And I am tired of hearing only bad news, so --

11          MR. URAVITCH: Let's just say we have no  
12 intention of terminating the Committee or members  
13 thereof, so --

14          CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: All right.

15          MR. URAVITCH: We want you guys around.

16          CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Brian has a positive  
17 suggestion. I will take one of those.

18          MR. MELZIAN: In addition to working with EPA,  
19 I'm also on the Board of Directors for the National  
20 Association of Marine Laboratories and President of the  
21 Northeastern Association of the Great Lakes  
22 Laboratories. We had a meeting in Washington, D.C.

1 I'm putting on different hats right now.

2 In the Board Meeting in Washington, D.C., we  
3 invited (Inaudible) and Jones who worked for the Office  
4 of Science and Technology (Inaudible) whose boss is  
5 Jack Marberger, who meets with the Present every  
6 morning. So we asked this lady to just brief this  
7 National Association for Marine Laboratories and she  
8 invited Natalie to a briefing with Jack Marberger.

9 So, that is just an example of where we could  
10 have various groups, ask people to attend meetings to  
11 talk. There are different kinds of mechanisms. They  
12 are perfectly legal and appropriate.

13 I can't do that as a federal employee; but it  
14 follows up on what Max was saying. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yes. Thank you, Brian.

16 Okay. My view is that we can make this  
17 enterprise succeed partly -- well, mostly by the work  
18 that we do. And it is good to whisper in the right  
19 sets of ears; but it is also better, I think, to  
20 produce good work products that are functional and  
21 coherent. And that is what I am concerned about and I  
22 think all of us are here for that exact same reason.

1           So, we have a few minutes before we break for  
2 lunch. This is a combination pep talk and kind of a  
3 strategic session to get us in the mood to start to  
4 produce something that will be of use to Mary at the  
5 Interior and others.

6           So, that's it. Let's get down to cases here  
7 in the few minutes before we break for lunch.

8           Right after lunch, you are going to go to your  
9 Subcommittees. We will not reconvene. You will have  
10 your lunch and at 1:00 o'clock the Subcommittees will  
11 meet. Two of them will be in this room. Arbitrarily  
12 do you have them assigned, Lauren, or do you --

13           MS. WENZEL: No, they are not assigned.

14           CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Then let's arbitrarily say  
15 groups 1 and 2 come back here and allocate yourself at  
16 either end of the room. And Subcommittee 3 goes where?

17           MS. WENZEL: To Monte's Boardroom after the  
18 Coastline Cafe.

19           CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: So there is a small room  
20 next to the Coastline Cafe called "Monte's Boardroom"?  
21 Sounds fun.

22           Okay. So that Subcommittee 3 will go there.

1     Okay. And 1 and 2 will come here and you can allocate  
2     yourself at either end of this room. That is the  
3     logistical side of things.

4             Let me think. I've got two or three things  
5     that I think we ought to address.

6             Let me say this. Mary has told us by October  
7     of '07 it would be very nice to have some stuff. She  
8     would like to have some stuff in her statement.

9             That means we have three meetings. We have  
10    this one, we have an October meeting in '06 -- the only  
11    reason that matters, it falls into '07 fiscal year --  
12    and we have a spring meeting. We could move that a  
13    bit. But I'm counting the three meetings.

14            So, when Mary says "by October", I didn't mean  
15    to say that -- she works for the Government -- she  
16    means by September 30th.

17            MS. WENZEL: Actually, it's October 31st.

18            CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: It's October 31st.

19            MS. WENZEL: So we do have a potential for a  
20    fourth meeting.

21            CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: We do have a potential for  
22    a fourth meeting. Okay. Is that -- Mary, is that

1     okay?

2                 MS. GLACKIN:   Yes.

3                 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY:   So, let's say we have four  
4     meetings -- which is not so bad; right?

5                 We really have only had three or four really  
6     functional coherent meetings in our former life.  
7     Right?

8                 Leaving off the first democratic encounter  
9     referred to as -- what was the word you used?

10                MS. GLACKIN:   Memorable.

11                CHAIRMAN BROMLEY:   Memorable.   Yeah.   And  
12     there's some other adjectives that were brought.

13                So, if you leave that one off --

14                So, anyway, I think we have four meetings,  
15     which is not so bad -- unless the budget disappears.

16                So, I think we have four meetings.   That is  
17     even better than three.

18                I have a sense, to the extent that we were  
19     successful in our first incarnation -- because we gave  
20     a great deal of time to our subcommittees, broke up  
21     into small groups, we worked hard on important  
22     questions, we hammered out our disagreements there,

1 brought it back to the full group for ratification and  
2 so on -- I would like to suggest that we try to follow  
3 that pattern here as well.

4 We have, in a sense, a greater opportunity, I  
5 believe, now to make tangible progress.

6 As good as we feel about our first work  
7 product, let us acknowledge that it was very general.  
8 It had to be general.

9 But now, with the questions that we have, the  
10 Charge that we have, the Subcommittees that we've set  
11 up, we have a great opportunity now, it seems to me, to  
12 get very specific about pressing issues. Some of them  
13 were not addressed before. We left them on the table.  
14 Some of them are new. Mary has given us some ideas.  
15 So, I want to talk about that.

16 But let me say this: That the Subcommittees  
17 will be the basis for our success or failure -- and  
18 that means a lot is riding on it.

19 So, let's talk just briefly about how those  
20 might work. You have a list before you, I think, of  
21 Subcommittee makeup in your packet. Let me call your  
22 attention to that handout.



1           You will notice there we have the three  
2       Subcommittees. Their subject matters, we will come  
3       back to that in a minute.

4           We had over the last -- well, since November,  
5       I guess actually since we were out of business as of  
6       June of last year -- we had Interim Co-Chairs. As you  
7       know, Bonnie and I and the MPA staff, basically Lauren  
8       are Joe and sometimes Charlie and a few others, carried  
9       on some telephone conversations, all of it informal  
10      because we were not legal. Subcommittees had  
11      conversations.

12          So, what we have here is a list of the three  
13      Subcommittees and what we call "Interim Cochairs". So,  
14      I would like to visit with you briefly about those  
15      three Subcommittees. The intention is that you will  
16      spin off into your three groups and that you would have  
17      during the early part of your discussions some  
18      clarifying discussions and some commitments made to  
19      tasks -- and I will come back to that.

20          But at the end of the meeting today of the  
21      Subcommittees -- that would be by 3:15, say by 3:00  
22      o'clock -- you will have elected, by whatever means you

1 wish, your leadership for the next period, whatever  
2 that turns out to be.

3 The "Cochair" idea emerged for Subcommittee 3,  
4 where we have both the social science component and the  
5 natural science component, the idea would be that there  
6 would be two people from these two different  
7 disciplinary communities which would share leadership.  
8 I think, speaking for myself and Bonnie, I don't  
9 believe we have strong preferences if you have Cochair  
10 or Chair and Vice Chair. We leave that to your own  
11 devices.

12 Subcommittee 1, Bob Bendick has been serving  
13 as Interim Cochair and has asked that, because of some  
14 other time commitments, that he not continue in that  
15 role.

16 Dave Benton is not here and probably would not  
17 be good to --

18 Well, it could be good.

19 On second thought, who more appropriate to be  
20 stuck with the leadership role than someone who is not  
21 here?

22 But I have visited with Max Peterson and Bob

1     Zales -- and, of course, Bob is here. So, the idea  
2     would be that in Subcommittee 1, as you people go into  
3     your meeting here after lunch, that we would like to  
4     ask Bob and Max and Bob Zales to sort of get this group  
5     going, play an interim leadership role; and then at the  
6     end of the period, you people can elect who you want to  
7     be your Chairs.

8                 Subcommittee 2, Tony Chatwin and George  
9     Lapointe have been involved with this and in several  
10    conversations they have both indicated a willingness to  
11    continue. This is not a campaign speech for them; but  
12    the deal here is that when you meet at 1:00 o'clock,  
13    they will be expected to get this thing started. And  
14    rather you throw them out at the end of the period or  
15    what -- I have no idea -- it is up to you.

16                The same thing applies to Subcommittee 3.  
17    John Halsey and Steve Murray played that role as  
18    Interim, so that is why their name is listed here.

19                Each of those Subcommittees will be expected  
20    to, before you report back, to have ratified or elected  
21    your leadership.

22                Is that clear? Is everybody comfortable with

1     this?  Is that okay?

2                 (No audible response.)

3                 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY:  Let's talk about the  
4     Charge, because it is my hope that by 3:00 o'clock,  
5     when you stop your Subcommittee work and elect your  
6     leaders, that you will be very clear on what it is that  
7     you think you ought to do.  We would very much like to  
8     have that pinned down today, if we could.

9                 If you look at the schedule tomorrow morning,  
10    at 8:05 we are asking you to come in and update us.  
11    So, you have from 8:05 to 9:30 to tell us what you are  
12    going to do.  And since you are going to be partying  
13    tonight, that means that you need to get that  
14    straightened out, I think, this afternoon.

15                So, with that, let me switch to the Charge.  
16    We are going to switch to the tighter version that Mary  
17    gave us on the screen.

18                Feedback, dialogue with stakeholders; but  
19    then, if you look down at the bottom of that handout  
20    over on page 2, there are some fairly specific issues.  
21    There is one "Key Question" for Subcommittee -- I don't  
22    need to read it, you have it there -- and then there

1 are related questions.

2 I guess what I would like to ask is that each  
3 Subcommittee take this printed report that you have in  
4 your packet, make sure you are in agreement with and  
5 understand the "Key Question" that is before you,  
6 elaborate as you see fit, critique it as you see fit,  
7 and then go to the list of "Related Questions" and  
8 figure out whether it is possible in some sort of  
9 plausible structure, knowing that you will not have  
10 money for Subcommittee Meetings, how many of these  
11 "Related Questions" are you going to be able to  
12 address, what do you think of the way those questions  
13 are put, would you like to reword them.

14 I think the point is: You have before you a  
15 wonderful agenda of things to do and it is up to you to  
16 decide how much of that can be done coherently, how  
17 much of it needs to be reworded, and which parts of it  
18 cannot possibly be done.

19 How is that? Does that make sense to you?

20 So, by the end of your meeting today at 3:00,  
21 I guess it is when we come back, around 3:15, I would  
22 hope -- we would hope that you could really grab a hold

1 of these three Key Questions, each one of you have one  
2 Key Question and four or five Related Questions, and  
3 that is the subject of your meeting this afternoon.  
4 Okay?

5 So that by morning -- if you need to do a  
6 little bit of fine-tuning this evening after your  
7 dinner, that is fine; but by 8:05 in the morning, we,  
8 as a full FAC, would very much like clarity about what  
9 it is you intend to do because, in a sense -- don't  
10 forget -- we need to authorize you to do that.

11 You are a Subcommittee of us and we, as a full  
12 Committee, retain control over what it is you do and  
13 how you spend your time and our money -- or Joe's money  
14 or Lauren's money. So, in a sense, you need to tell us  
15 what your agenda is and we will tomorrow morning ratify  
16 that and get you going.

17 I call your attention, as you think about  
18 that, I call your attention to Mary's idea that "Let us  
19 not necessarily wait until the end of our fourth  
20 meeting to have her something." You might think about  
21 stages. You might think about steps, products.

22 I am quite excited, actually, about the

1 prospect of producing three separate documents and  
2 three themes that can stand alone. We now have our  
3 document about the framework -- I don't want to use  
4 that word -- but our work product from before.

5           And if we want to find Ocean Champions, if  
6 that is what all the concern was a moment ago, if we  
7 want to find people in politically useful high places  
8 to further the interest of this work, now is the time  
9 to do it -- not with the general document that we  
10 produced over the last two years about which we feel  
11 very good, and justifiably so. It is a necessary step.

12           But, now, this is where the action comes.  
13 This is the kind of work that will speak to  
14 politicians -- regional issues, incentives,  
15 implementations, science gaps, science needs.

16           Now is our chance, I think, to produce work  
17 products that will get the kind of attention many of  
18 you were hoping that we could get. This is where we  
19 will attract it; and, so, I urge you to think of it in  
20 those lights.

21           Tomorrow morning I would like to hear from you  
22 whether you think for your particular Subcommittee you

1     need one document at the end or whether you see  
2     feasibility in producing one or two or three shorter  
3     pieces that can make their way out into the cyberspace  
4     and do good work.

5             So, thoughts, reactions, comments?

6             (No audible response.)

7             CHAIRMAN BROMLEY:   Okay?   Is that okay?   Is  
8     everyone clear about what we would like for you to do?

9             (Affirmative response.)

10            CHAIRMAN BROMLEY:   Lauren, do you want to add  
11    anything to that?

12            MS. WENZEL:   If there are any questions about  
13    Subcommittee.

14            (No audible response.)

15            MS. WENZEL:   I just would remind people that  
16    we are going to be in Coastline Restaurant for lunch.  
17    I think everybody should have gotten a ticket from  
18    Bunny.   If you didn't, Bunny is the keeper of the  
19    tickets.

20            They set up a buffet for us in a certain part  
21    of the restaurant.   I would have to check.   It might be  
22    upstairs.   We have an hour for lunch.



1 MS. SPARKS: It is not upstairs, Bonnie. Just  
2 when you walk into the restaurant, you go around to the  
3 left and there is an area reserved for you all. The  
4 waiter will take your ticket.

5 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Is this room going to be  
6 locked while we are there?

7 MS. SPARKS: It can be.

8 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. So we will get  
9 out -- unless you want to spend your lunch hour in  
10 here -- we will leave the room and then it will be  
11 locked so your valuables are safe.

12 Wally?

13 DR. PEREYRA: Mr. Chairman.

14 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah.

15 DR. PEREYRA: At the end of our printed sheet  
16 here, it says "to be assigned".

17 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Right. Jim -- Well, speak  
18 for yourself, Jim. I thought your sense was you wanted  
19 to think a little bit about where your interest might  
20 lie -- or are you ready to declare?

21 MR. WOODS: How about a chair by the lake?

22 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: And, Jim, by the way, "None

1 of the above" is not one of your options.

2 MR. WOODS: Well, before I jump in with both  
3 feet, I'm just going to observe a little bit. I'm kind  
4 of leaning towards Subcommittee 1, but let me --

5 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Thank you. And  
6 Andrew --

7 MS. WENZEL: Andrew Sansom is not here, but --  
8 I'm sorry. Can you State your name?

9 MR. PEWLAGE: Warren Pewlage.

10 MS. WENZEL: -- but Warren Pewlage is here and  
11 he is going to sit in on Subcommittee 3.

12 A PARTICIPANT: Where is the restaurant?

13 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: The restaurant is down this  
14 hall -- Lauren, if you could direct him.

15 MS. WENZEL: It's just around to the right.  
16 You follow it out to the door where most of us came in.  
17 Just go around to the right here, you'll see it.

18 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: So, is that fine with  
19 everyone?

20 We are not adjourned. We are just in recess.

21 So, at 1:00 o'clock, those of you who are sort  
22 of in leadership positions, so that the

1       Subcommittees -- you now have my job, which is to  
2       gather up your flock and take them to the right place  
3       on time.

4                       (Brief recess: 12:01 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.)

## A F T E R N O O N   S E S S I O N

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Called to order.

Okay. I believe, from what I can tell, we had quite a productive session of the Subcommittees and we are now ready to pick up at 3:30 for the program.

We are very happy we had a representative from the Coastal States Organization meet with us at one of our earlier meetings. I'm sorry. I forget his name, but --

MS. ANDREWS: Tony.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Yeah. So now we are very happy to have Katherine Andrews. I see she has a different name up on the screen; but "Khaki" and "Katherine" are the same.

Ms. Andrews, we are very happy to have you with us. And she is going to offer State perspectives on the creation of the National System.

And the floor is yours. Thanks for coming.

MS. ANDREWS: Thanks very much. Is this on?

(Microphone adjustment.)

Thanks very much. As your Chair told you, my name is Khaki Andrews. I'm the Executive Director of

1 the Coastal States Organization.

2 For those of you not familiar with CSO, CSO  
3 represents the 35 Governors of the Coastal States and  
4 Territories of the United States. It was formed in the  
5 1970's out of the National Governors Association.

6 Some of you may remember that I have appeared  
7 before this FAC in another capacity. Prior to this job  
8 as Executive Director of CSO, I was the Director of  
9 Coastal Aquatic Park Managed Areas for Florida's  
10 Department of Mammal Protection, where I was the State  
11 Co-Trustee of the National Keys, National Marine  
12 Sanctuary. So, it was my job to be in cahoots with  
13 Billy Causey, which was nothing short of a pleasure.

14 Many of my antidotes will be from Florida  
15 because that is what I know and what I'm aware of.

16 The first point I want to make is that the  
17 States are not a model. We do have recommendations  
18 that have gone through an extended process and the  
19 States are very comfortable with these recommendations;  
20 but they don't agree on absolutely everything. You  
21 know, when you are representing Alaska, Alabama,  
22 Mississippi, Massachusetts, there is clearly going to

1 be some differences.

2 So, these are the States' recommendations, but  
3 I did want to make sure of that point.

4 One other thing I wanted to say is: I have  
5 been very encouraged by the dialogue of this Committee.  
6 The questions you are asking and the concerns you are  
7 raising are the exact same questions the States are  
8 asking and the concerns that they are raising as well.

9 So, I think you will see a lot of issues that  
10 are recommendations address are a lot of the same  
11 questions that I have been hearing here today.

12 First off is that the States want to be fully  
13 involved in a National System. Most States are very  
14 interested in the National System and do want to  
15 participate. To be absolutely frank, some States are  
16 very wary. When they think national and they think  
17 Federal, they get nervous. They think their  
18 jurisdiction is going to be usurped or it's going to be  
19 an unbending system or whatever.

20 And then there's also lots of questions that  
21 they still have that remain unanswered just because  
22 they remain unanswered.

1           But why the State participation is so  
2 critical, I think, to the National System, what the  
3 National System is trying to achieve, is as of right  
4 now 85 percent of the existing sites are in the State  
5 Waters. These are critical resources to the nation.  
6 This is where most of the people of the nation interact  
7 with the marine environment is in State Waters and  
8 along the coast. So, we do think States are critical  
9 participants since most likely State sites will  
10 continue to be the majority of the National System for  
11 the future.

12           One thing I also wanted to point out is a lot  
13 of times in State sites you will see that they contain  
14 uplands and marine waters. It is not just marine.  
15 There is that land component. And you will see some  
16 examples here from New Jersey and the Virgin Islands  
17 and North Carolina where there is often parks or  
18 whatever that encompass both the land and the water.  
19 And that is just a quality that I think you all should  
20 keep in mind as you move forward. And even in the  
21 State of Alaska, it took all of these different  
22 decision points and they also encompass both water and

1 land.

2 So, how do we come about coming up with the  
3 recommendations? We had the CSO Report on State MPA  
4 Policies and Tony MacDonald did come here and report to  
5 this FAC a little over a year ago FAC.

6 Since then, we have held three regional  
7 workshops in California, Chicago, Illinois and in  
8 Florida, and then developed a statewide paper and gave  
9 a presentation at CZ. And just last Friday, April 21,  
10 2006, we issued our final report on the recommendations  
11 to the National Framework.

12 We also have a State Advisory Group, that is  
13 the SAG, where we have representatives from the States  
14 and they will be engaging the NOAA and DOI released  
15 National Framework and we will continue to work with  
16 NOAA and with DOI on comments from the States into that  
17 Framework.

18 There is the cover of our report. I imagine  
19 it will be posted on the MPA web site in the very near  
20 future. We did have early draft of the recommendations  
21 which were given over to MPA so they could take the  
22 State comments into consideration as they developed the



1 National Framework.

2 In your packets, there is a one-pager that is  
3 kind of a short version of our recommendations as well.

4 Number one: Ensure that the MPA system is  
5 National, not Federal.

6 Critical distinction through the States. A  
7 National System, they get to participate. A Federal  
8 System, not so much. The States, the local  
9 governments, the Native Americans and Tribes have  
10 established and managed MPAs for decades.

11 It is still a little unclear to the States and  
12 the Territories about how these existing sites in the  
13 National System are going to fit together. You know,  
14 some of the States have the attitude of: "Well, we  
15 have MPAs. We are part of the Nation. So, we must be  
16 part of the National System."

17 You know, it is like the whole designation  
18 thing is still a little murky to them and that is  
19 something we will just have to work through in the  
20 future.

21 So, if the system is National, the site, even  
22 if it is part of the National System, does not have to

1 be managed by Federal Government. It can be a State.  
2 It can be a Tribe.

3 But we do want to make that clear that the  
4 States want to be part of the National System under  
5 their authorities and under their jurisdiction.

6 So, to that end, we think that the National  
7 System should focus on enhancing existing sites and  
8 filling in the gaps.

9 Figure out what you have, make them better;  
10 but, then, also look to the future and figure out where  
11 are the highest priority sites that are not covered,  
12 that are not within an MPA.

13 And as part of the discussion among the  
14 Subcommittees, you know, I started thinking that this,  
15 you know, the filling of the gaps is in some ways kind  
16 of likening the National System of MPAs to the National  
17 Trail System. And I kind of like that analogy. It is  
18 trying to draw that connectivity. Because the National  
19 Trail System, some of it is Federal, some of it is  
20 State, some of it is local; but it all links together.

21 It gets a little more complicated, of course,  
22 in the marine environment. Because with the National

1 Trail, you just have to draw one solid line. That is  
2 not going to be the case in National Marine Protective  
3 Areas Systems. You don't need an absolute continuous  
4 line with these things -- but I did like the analogies.

5 Recommendation 2: Create a blueprint that  
6 clearly defines what the National MPA System will  
7 include.

8 Now, when I say a "blueprint", I do not mean  
9 kind of a map of the site identification. The States  
10 would go just bananas if the Feds started picking out  
11 the sites without their input.

12 But one of the things that was very important  
13 to the States, that I think this FAC has struggled  
14 with, is they want definite and clear terms for what is  
15 being used and what is being said.

16 They also want specific goals of the National  
17 System. Now, there may be multiple goals and you will  
18 have different sites directed at different goals; but  
19 it is kind of like: Why are we doing this? What are  
20 we trying to achieve?

21 If you are using a nomination system,  
22 explicitly delineate the site inclusion criteria and

1 authority. You know, it is just like: Well, what are  
2 the criteria? How do you get in and how do you stay  
3 out.

4 The blueprint should also provide a  
5 methodology for calculating the expected costs and the  
6 value added benefits of the MPAs.

7 In one of the other Subcommittees, they were  
8 talking about costs and benefits and all that. And it  
9 is not that I think this group can actually quantify  
10 those benefits and cost; but it would be helpful, I  
11 think, to the managers to know what methodologies to  
12 use and what categories of costs and benefits that they  
13 need to be thinking about as they seek to do that.

14 The blueprint should also enhance the regional  
15 and national mechanisms for ongoing sharing of  
16 information and coordination and this blueprint should  
17 also clarify how existing State MPA sites meet the  
18 ecological, cultural and social goals of the National  
19 MPA System.

20 Recommendation Three. Let me step outside of  
21 State Water for a moment. States absolutely recognize  
22 that there need to be more MPAs in Federal Waters. And

1 actually one of the -- and this drives California  
2 absolutely batty -- that there is not a process in the  
3 Federal Government where if a State wanted a site in  
4 Federal Waters because it compliments their State MPA,  
5 where do I go? There is a de facto band on sanctuaries  
6 and there is really no process to do that.

7 And, so, to fulfill this national ecosystem  
8 base management approach, it is essential that  
9 establishing MPAs not be limited to State Waters and  
10 that the Federal have some rational process for doing  
11 it in Federal Waters, so the States know where to go.

12 Recommendation Four: Involve States as  
13 partners.

14 As I had said before, States and Tribes are  
15 all, you know, working to protect the values and the  
16 resources that are necessary for a National System of  
17 MPAs. And the MPA managers need to be included as  
18 really critical partners in the management of the  
19 systems because these are the folks that are getting it  
20 done on the ground, who are having to balance all the  
21 interests of the stakeholders.

22 If a National System is meeting and addressing

1     their needs, then there will be that added benefits;  
2     but if it is not, you know, they are not going to want  
3     to play. And I think that that is a pretty critical  
4     component.

5             About the definitive process to establish  
6     State participation is also the interaction between  
7     State and Federal sites kind of across the waters, the  
8     transboundary issue, and also that MPAs in Federal  
9     Waters may affect State coastal water and resources --  
10    and you are well aware of that.

11            Another issue is this issue of Regional  
12    Governments and, you know, what do we do.

13            I added a slide. I had a slight digression  
14    here.

15            Because we are seeing a lot of this in a lot  
16    of different areas in Washington, D.C. -- and the MPAs  
17    and the whole Regional Government I think is one  
18    example of the struggles we are having.

19            For about 200 years or so, getting in this  
20    country, the United States and the Territories made up  
21    the country. And then it was only about, you know,  
22    under President Reagan, within the last 25 years, that

1 the EEZ was extended so far and became official United  
2 States Territory.

3 So now I think we have more United States  
4 jurisdiction outside of State and Territory  
5 jurisdictional authority than in. That is a profound  
6 change.

7 And I think what the U.S. Ocean Commission and  
8 the Pew Ocean Commission found in identifying all the  
9 problems is essentially that our Government has not  
10 caught up to the extension of the EEZ. So, you know,  
11 when we are going to these Regional Government  
12 initiatives, what we are trying to do is make our  
13 Government catch up to that extension.

14 But I do think that this MPA effort has to be  
15 plugged into the burgeoning Regional Government  
16 efforts. Because what the Pew Ocean Commission said  
17 and the U.S. Ocean Commission said was: "No more stove  
18 pipes. Cut across Federal and State agency authorities  
19 and get it integrated."

20 So, as MMS is out there planning for  
21 alternative energy and increased uses, you would hope  
22 that that is also -- and the efforts of the MPA Center

1 are kind of getting on the same page. So, you are  
2 figuring out what areas need to be used, what areas are  
3 probably inappropriate for use.

4 So, there is my soap box on the Regional  
5 Government.

6 One more thing. Use the Regional Government  
7 that is already getting created. Don't try to do it  
8 yourself or you are just going to be creating kind of  
9 an MPA stove pipe. You need to figure out what  
10 regional body is most appropriate for each different  
11 region -- and it may be different in the regions. You  
12 may have fishery management councils in one area and  
13 you may have like the Gulf Alliance in another. But I  
14 would recommend that you use what is already working on  
15 there.

16 Recommendation Five: Assist and support the  
17 States.

18 Eighty-five percent of the current systems are  
19 desperate for resources -- desperate. You really need  
20 to enhance the existing States. They need technical  
21 assistance. They need scientific research. They need  
22 financial resources.



1           Let me tell you an antidote from Florida. In  
2 the National Keys, it's over a million acres or so,  
3 part of the National Marine Sanctuary, and they had a  
4 staff of about 50 fleet of boats and they were totally  
5 strapped to do everything they needed to do.

6           One of our preeminent State sites, the Big  
7 Bend National Sea Grasses Aquatic Preserve, also over a  
8 million acres, just a stunning -- one of the biggest  
9 sea grass meadows in the world, we had four staff and  
10 two boats for over a million acres. They are dying.

11           So, I do think that a National System, by  
12 being a place to go that offers technical assistance to  
13 the States in helping them make the existing sites all  
14 that they can be, is huge value added -- huge.

15           Some examples of "Federal support" is  
16 monitoring and assessments and evaluation.

17           "Effective management enforcement" does not  
18 mean the Feds need to do it; but the Feds can help the  
19 States in some strategies.

20           And then the facilitation and coordination  
21 between the States and between maybe the, you know, the  
22 transboundary issues.

1           We really need to avoid paper parks; and, so,  
2           having that technical assistance can really help with  
3           that.

4           Performance measures and evaluate. You know,  
5           adaptive management. We want these things to get  
6           continually better. We want to make smarter decisions.

7           An explicit and practical set of performance  
8           indicators to evaluate the effectiveness of individual  
9           MPAs should be developed in consultation with the  
10          Coastal States and other stakeholders.

11          You know, the indicator has to match the  
12          issues on the ground and the goals of the MPA, so there  
13          has to be flexibility; but I understand the need to  
14          aggregate up so you can compare between sites and  
15          compare regions.

16          And this is going to be incredibly difficult,  
17          because how do you compare like how a mangrove-based  
18          MPA is doing with a salt marsh. You know, it gets a  
19          little dicey. But we understand that we do need to  
20          evaluate these things and there do needs to be  
21          performance indicators.

22          Recommendation Seven -- this is our last

1 one -- is outreach and education about MPA goals to all  
2 stakeholders.

3 I think we are losing this battle right now.

4 In Florida, you know, when people hear "MPA",  
5 they think marine reserve and they go: "God, I hate  
6 those things." "MPAs, I hate them." "I want to fish  
7 where I want to fish."

8 And then you say: "Well, but what about John  
9 Pennycamp Marine Park?"

10 "Oh, yeah. Well, I love that."

11 And just like: "Well, and what about  
12 Woodberry Bay National Research Reserve, you can fish  
13 there. That is an MPA."

14 "Oh, yeah. I love that, too."

15 But we are losing our battle. People are  
16 equating all MPAs with marine reserves and it is a much  
17 broader context. And, so, people need to understand  
18 the value that these things can bring to them. They  
19 need to understand what it means. They need to be  
20 engaged in the development of the strategies to address  
21 this. We are never going to have enough enforcement to  
22 enforce everything that needs to be enforced.

1           Somebody at Subcommittee Number 2 was talking  
2 about kind of a civil contract. You bet.

3           I think there has to be an element of kind of  
4 some self-enforcement and getting people aware of what  
5 is going on and brought in so that they can be out  
6 there on the waters being your educators. It's just  
7 your average citizen.

8           As I said before, the States tend to be more  
9 focused on the land-water interaction, where most of  
10 the people are, and, you know, we have to make sure  
11 that the human uses are there.

12           I firmly believe the National System can be a  
13 benefits to the States and the Territories. We do need  
14 assistance in enhancing our existing sites and  
15 communicating with the folks out there; and, so, we  
16 will certainly be working -- continue to work with all  
17 of you all as you move forward on this. I appreciate  
18 the service of this FAC and all the struggles you are  
19 going through right now.

20           We are ready to partner with you guys because  
21 the States are interested in making this a success.

22           I will be happy to take any questions or

1        comments or anything else. And the hands go up.

2                Yes, Bob?

3                MR. ZALES: Bob Zales, II. Please don't take  
4        this wrong. I don't want to be argumentative. Your  
5        presentation was nice.

6                But everything that I see on this piece of  
7        paper, front and back, with the exclusion of "National"  
8        versus "Federal", I remember being in the paper that we  
9        spent two years developing and sending the Board and  
10       two Secretaries.

11               So, in my mind, either the State people have  
12       not read what we sent forward or -- because it appears  
13       to me that everything they are recommending here we  
14       have already done. We are making the same  
15       recommendations.

16               And to that, you made a statement about in  
17       California there was no process or they felt there was  
18       no process to develop MPAs in Federal Waters. Now,  
19       unless that council system out there is entirely  
20       different than what they have in the Gulf of Mexico, I  
21       have to argue with that.

22               Because in the Gulf of Mexico, they clearly --

1 Council develops MPAs in Federal Water and they do this  
2 with State Representatives sitting at the table with  
3 State people also as members of the Council sitting at  
4 the table and work hand-in-hand in developing that.  
5 So, I don't understand that statement.

6 MS. ANDREWS: I guess I should have clarified  
7 this. California is not necessarily wanting to do this  
8 as a fisheries issue. You know, sometimes it's, you  
9 know, an MPA not just for fisheries. It is for broader  
10 issues.

11 But they just think that, you know, that the  
12 sanctuaries does not have a de facto band and they did  
13 not think the fisheries council was addressing all the  
14 issues they wanted to address.

15 MR. ZALES: Well, now, in that case, the  
16 fisheries council can only deal with fisheries issues.

17 MS. ANDREWS: Right. And I think it was a  
18 broader -- it was a broader concept.

19 MR. ZALES: But like I say, I would think that  
20 everything that we have already sent forward  
21 essentially addresses every recommendation on this  
22 paper with that one exception of "National" versus

1 "Federal" and I don't think there is a problem with  
2 changing "Federal" to "National".

3 MS. ANDREWS: No. And like I said, a lot of  
4 what this FAC has been talking about today, still a lot  
5 of the same questions and concerns that you all are  
6 struggling with is also what the States are struggling  
7 with, you know; but this is kind of what has come out  
8 of those three workshops that we had with the State  
9 managers.

10 But like I said, I do think there are a lot of  
11 synergies between what this FAC has done and what the  
12 State has done. And it is not that the States did  
13 not -- you know, the folks in the workshops did not  
14 agree with what the FAC was doing. We were just  
15 listening to the members of our workshops and that is  
16 what we are reporting.

17 It just happens that we are all getting to  
18 about the same place, which I actually think is a good  
19 thing.

20 MR. ZALES: Oh, yeah. Me, too. Sure, sure.

21 DR. HIXON: Mark Hixon. Thanks for your  
22 presentation.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Mark, can you get to a microphone?

DR. HIXON: Sure. Mark Hixon. Thanks for your presentation.

A question I have: In the meetings, the groups that were meeting that produced this document, were they State Government people or from various stakeholder groups within the Coastal States or what? What was the membership specifically?

MS. ANDREWS: Mostly we focused on State Agency, but we also had some kind of -- like the Florida Water Management Districts and also local governments; but mostly on-the-ground managers of MPAs. We also included like some of the NEPs, which would have been part of the Federal system. So, it was a mix. We also included cultural officers of the States as well.

DR. HIXON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Wally, Mr. Pereyra.

DR. PEREYRA: Thank you. Wally Pereyra, North Pacific area.

I would just like to reiterate a comment that



1 Bob made; and that is, in the process of forming a lot  
2 of the MPAs which you see in the Inventory, Councils  
3 which are made up of State Representatives, except for  
4 the one Federal Representative that was a voting member  
5 of the Councils, they are making these decisions. And  
6 in the process, itself, there is a lot of stakeholder  
7 input which includes also additional State input there.

8 So, I think there is very significant State  
9 input into the formation of MPAs at the present time,  
10 at least in the sustainable resource management MPAs  
11 for the fisheries.

12 But in addition, this is a two-way street. I  
13 think the States have to be cognizant of the impacts  
14 and developments that they have within the States or  
15 the decisions that are made within the States can have  
16 upon the effectiveness of the MPAs that are in the  
17 Federal Zone. And I think a lot of the Coastal Zone  
18 development issues and whatnot have very profound  
19 effects on MPAs and their effectiveness. So this has  
20 got to be both ways in terms of the coordination and  
21 involvement that is going on.

22 MS. ANDREWS: Yeah. I think that is right.

1 Coastal development is a huge issue, quite the  
2 struggle. But one thing is the Fishery Management  
3 Councils have a lot of authority to manage the  
4 fisheries and that is great; but when I was in Florida  
5 and we were managing our State system, they were not  
6 being managed for kind of fish. People were allowed to  
7 fish in them. They were open to fishing absolutely.  
8 They were more about habitat protection.

9 And, so, the Fisheries Management Councils  
10 really were not -- the fisheries was not really the  
11 issue. We were going at a broader stream of  
12 indicators.

13 So, some MPAs are absolutely, you know, from  
14 the Councils and are tied to the fish; but there is a  
15 lot that are not as well. They have other goals.

16 Yeah, John.

17 DR. OGDEN: Thanks, Khaki. That was  
18 interesting.

19 When you were discussing point number 3, you  
20 said -- it isn't on the paper, but you said something  
21 that essentially equated the MPA effort with  
22 ecosystem-based management. And we just had a long

1 discussion in our Subcommittee on the interrelationship  
2 of the National System and MPAs and ecosystem-based  
3 management.

4 Can you give a perspective on this or was that  
5 a slip of the tongue or --

6 MS. ANDREWS: I guess, you know,  
7 "ecosystem-based management", right now people in D.C.  
8 are really getting wrapped around the axle about that  
9 phrase, and there's some definite kind of push back.  
10 We are like: "What does that mean?"

11 So, I guess I just see "ecosystem-based  
12 management" as "managing places". You know, it is just  
13 about managing places instead of managing government  
14 programs like the Clean Water Act and all that, which  
15 we absolutely need.

16 But, you know, as you take the place and then  
17 you take the different programs and figure how they  
18 integrate in and see which program, so when people --

19 So, MPAs, if you are looking at, you know, one  
20 certain place, depending on how big it is, it may be  
21 appropriate.

22 But I guess I'm just saying if you are looking

1 at an ecosystem-based management approach, you are  
2 looking at the struggles and the issues and the impacts  
3 and what are the hurdles to maintaining an area in a  
4 condition that you want and addressing it.

5 Now, you may need MPAs to do that in some  
6 areas. Some areas you may not. And, so, but it is --  
7 but you are kind of taking a look at the place here you  
8 are talking about.

9 DR. OGDEN: If I could follow-up. Did you  
10 also mean to distinguish between MPAs, as Bob and Wally  
11 just referred to them, in the fisheries management and  
12 MPAs as habitat protection?

13 MS. ANDREWS: They are all MPAs. I guess what  
14 I'm saying is the definition of "MPA" -- you know, in  
15 Florida we use "Marine Managed Areas" because it didn't  
16 quite have the connotation of MPAs.

17 But fishery MPAs, but then there are kind of  
18 more habitat MPAs, you know, the Tortugas and the Keys,  
19 they talk about just protecting the assemblage and it  
20 wasn't, you know, basically really a fisheries thing,  
21 even though there was some fishing restrictions.

22 So, they are all MPAs. It is just that I

1 don't think the councils are the place for creating all  
2 MPAs because, you know, some of them are not really  
3 about the fisheries -- not all of them anyway.

4 MR. PETERSON: Khaki, I think what you have  
5 given us coincides with a lot we have already worked  
6 on.

7 Recently I heard a speaker say that we have  
8 rendered certain words completely meaningless because  
9 we don't understand what they mean. One of them is  
10 "ecosystem", because there is only one and that is the  
11 whole world. Everything else is a part of the  
12 ecosystem.

13 And people get nervous about "What do we mean  
14 when we say the 'Gulf Ecosystem'? Does that go all the  
15 way to Hawaii and beyond, back and forth?"

16 So "region" is a better word when we are  
17 talking about an area, because it can be based on  
18 natural resources, it can be based on jurisdiction, it  
19 can be based on a lot of other things.

20 But I would suggest that -- you haven't done  
21 that here -- but I think if we look at these, one thing  
22 I would have liked to have seen you add in this is the

1 whole approach needs to be cooperative. This is not  
2 going to work if it is just a State system, if it is  
3 just a Federal system, if it is just a tribal system.  
4 Unless there is cooperation across those boundaries,  
5 the whole system will fail.

6 So, anyway, I hope you will put in your  
7 summation the whole idea of cooperation between the  
8 various entities.

9 MS. ANDREWS: Yeah. No, that is a good point.  
10 I think we used the language of "partnerships", but  
11 "cooperation" is --

12 MR. PETERSON: "Partnership" is another one  
13 that has lost its meaning because everybody has used it  
14 to mean everybody from my brother, my sister, my  
15 brother-in-law --

16 MS. ANDREWS: But your point is well-taken.  
17 It is going to have to just work across all levels of  
18 government and State government, also.

19 MR. PETERSON: This listed six things and one  
20 of them is "partnership" and the other was "input".  
21 The other is "progress", which also means shooting your  
22 neighbor if you are in the Middle East.

1           That is the dictionary definition over there.

2           DR. CHATWIN: Thanks for the presentation. I  
3 have a question regarding Recommendation Number 5,  
4 "Assist and Support the States."

5           My name is Tony Chatwin. I'm working on the  
6 committee for Incentives and Implementation.

7           I wondered if you could share whether the  
8 participants in the workshops pointed to any  
9 mechanisms, any models that they found particularly  
10 effective in bringing about this collaboration between  
11 the Federal Government and the State?

12           MS. ANDREWS: Not that I remember, you know,  
13 from the workshop reports.

14           You know, in Florida, the Key Sanctuary, you  
15 know, because the Key Sanctuary bought a lot of  
16 resources; but from just a State perspective is --

17           You know, there has been this recognition  
18 about the social science side of things: How do people  
19 feel about it? Are people adhering to the regulations?  
20 Why aren't they adhering to the regulations? Do they  
21 know about it? What are the benefits? All of this  
22 social science side of things.

1           But most of the management agencies are still  
2 marine biologists. So, you know, we read the books and  
3 they are like: "Okay. You should do surveys and stuff  
4 of the local populous and get this."

5           Oh. Who knows how to do a survey that is  
6 statistically valid and who has the resources to do  
7 that?

8           You know, it's just like that kind of stuff is  
9 just very nuts and bolts about, you know, the managers  
10 are recognizing, yes, we need to have performance  
11 indicators based upon the people's involvement with  
12 these sites, but we don't even know where to start or  
13 where to go.

14          So, it is really just kind of helping managers  
15 get the information that they need and being an avenue  
16 of technical assistance. Capacity building is also  
17 helpful; and, then, of course, you know, the technical  
18 assistance can be of great use.

19          One other caution about your incentives is  
20 that you need to make sure you understand for the folks  
21 on the ground, being at the local and the State and the  
22 stakeholder level, is make sure you understand what is



1 an incentive and what is not.

2 At some point in time, I heard somebody say:  
3 "Well, it is part of the National System. NEPA will  
4 apply." Well, that is not an incentive to a lot of  
5 States.

6 It is just like: "NEPA? Forget that."

7 So, you know, it's just you need to make sure  
8 that you understand what is an incentive to a State and  
9 the local and the stakeholders and whatnot.

10 DR. CHATWIN: Just to follow up, where can we  
11 go to get more insight into what is an incentive to the  
12 States?

13 MS. ANDREWS: Well, through the MPA Center,  
14 they give us a grant and we have our contractor, Dr.  
15 Paul Pico, who is in the MPA Center, and he is the  
16 liaison between the MPA Center and the States. So, if  
17 the FAC needs information from the States, then we have  
18 that avenue open to us to go out and figure that out.

19 We do have our State Advisory Group that meets  
20 via telephone, so there is a group of State folks  
21 involved.

22 So, as you develop this, those avenues are

1 open to you.

2 DR. CHATWIN: Thank you.

3 MS. ANDREWS: Yeah, Bob.

4 MR. BENDICK: Bob Bendick. I guess I took it  
5 a little differently, Bob. The fact that it was very  
6 similar to our report was pretty encouraging in that we  
7 were not out of alignment with the States.

8 What I think is a little puzzling is that it  
9 seems like, while we haven't seen the final  
10 recommendations of the MPA Center, those seem to be a  
11 little different from either the States' or from our  
12 recommendations in some of the same ways.

13 And, so, you know, I'm wondering are there  
14 other groups of users or of interest that the -- or is  
15 it the financial constraints that the final report is  
16 responding to that are different, have a different  
17 perspective from the States or from the FAC?

18 That is not a question, I guess, for you.

19 But, you know, I think it's something we just  
20 need, as this thing comes forward, as we see that, it  
21 will probably be useful to know. And maybe that will  
22 fall out in this public review process -- who thinks

1     what about these things.

2                 MS. ANDREWS:   John?

3                 DR. OGDEN:   Getting back to the  
4     ecosystem-based management, "wrapped around the axle"  
5     doesn't sound so good to me.

6                 And, you know, it is written in these  
7     documents.  And as Max pointed out, you know, there are  
8     definitional problems.

9                 But it cannot just be that.  It must be  
10    something more about it that -- I mean is it the  
11    comprehensiveness of it or the intent or the presumed  
12    comprehensiveness of it that is --

13                I mean I don't quite understand why people are  
14    having heartburn about it -- you know, understanding  
15    that the definition is fuzzy as hell, I mean, yes.

16                MS. ANDREWS:   I'm not sure either; but here is  
17    my supposition, is that there is real fear that these  
18    regional governments, councils or partnerships, or  
19    whatever it will end up being, will supersede or trump  
20    existing authorities.

21                MR. PETERSON:   Yeah.

22                DR. OGDEN:   New government.

1 MS. ANDREWS: Yes.

2 MR. PETERSON: I think people understand State  
3 and Territorial Waters and Federal Waters and so on.  
4 When you start talking about an "ecosystem-based  
5 management", they think: Is that another layer on the  
6 top of this? And who is that? Who is managing the  
7 ecosystem?

8 So it's more of a fear factor, I think, when  
9 people say: "Is this a new United Nations thing?"  
10 "What is it?"

11 No. Seriously, people say: "What is this  
12 thing," you know. I think everybody believes  
13 scientifically that you have got to pay attention to  
14 the whole ecosystem. That is not very good management,  
15 I don't think.

16 MS. ANDREWS: Yeah, Jim.

17 DR. RAY: If you could just comment a little  
18 bit more on "States will require funding and technical  
19 assistance."

20 MS. ANDREWS: Like I say, there are State  
21 systems out there. Some of them have plenty of legal  
22 authority and even some political will to do more.

1 They really just don't have the funding or capacity to  
2 make those sites all they can be.

3 And we have a bunch of States, I think, out  
4 there struggling with these issues and recreating  
5 wheels; where, if we had a National System with a  
6 really fully-staffed, fully-funded National System,  
7 that could help with: "Okay. If you have a goal here  
8 and this is kind of what you want to measure to achieve  
9 that, then here is the survey you would use and here is  
10 how you would do it."

11 Just to give that technical assistance to the  
12 States, you know, would be enormously helpful so we are  
13 all not doing it individually.

14 Randy?

15 MR. BOWMAN: I have a question on timing. The  
16 summary calls for criteria and kind of what is supposed  
17 to be done. Do you believe the Feds should put that  
18 out now and start the system and let everybody sort of  
19 grow into it or should that be done in the States or do  
20 you believe that should be done to service the systems  
21 throughout?

22 MS. ANDREWS: I mean the States certainly want

1 a voice in what criteria we would use; but, you know,  
2 you have to start the dialogue somewhere, so it's -- we  
3 would hope that would be collaborative because since  
4 the States are managing most of the sites, at least the  
5 existing sites, that there is such a wealth of  
6 knowledge there, is that you would hope that they could  
7 help form the criteria that are being used to develop  
8 the sites.

9 But, you know, it is like to get it going, it  
10 often helps to get something out there for people to  
11 react to as opposed to saying "What do you think?"

12 So, it is kind of a mix, I guess. I'm staying  
13 out of it.

14 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Any other questions or  
15 comments for Katherine?

16 MS. ANDREWS: Well, this is my contact info.  
17 (Referencing slide.)

18 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: The top part or the bottom  
19 part?

20 MS. ANDREWS: I wish it was the top part.

21 But thanks very much for the time. Like I  
22 say, the States appreciate all the work of the FAC and

1 we look forward to working with you as this moves  
2 forward.

3 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you very much. Thank  
4 you. We evidently do not have anyone who wanted to  
5 appear before us for public comment. No controversy,  
6 so that is a good sign.

7 There are two individuals who asked for just a  
8 few seconds to -- they are on our Committee, so they  
9 are colleagues -- to raise some issues with us briefly.  
10 Briefly, Dennis Heinemann is going to talk a bit about  
11 something, and then Brian Melzian wanted a few seconds,  
12 also.

13 So, I promise this will be brief. This is  
14 informational items only, as I understand it. And then  
15 we will have a few comments about what we are doing for  
16 dinner, and then we are through for the day.

17 So, Dennis, would you like to start?

18 DR. HEINEMANN: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Okay. Thank you.

20 DR. HEINEMANN: Yes. I just wanted to make  
21 the Committee aware of an issue that hinges upon our  
22 mandate of what we are trying to do here.

1           As many of you may be aware, there is an  
2 internal discussion that's been going on for quite some  
3 time within NOAA between NOS and NMFS over who should  
4 have jurisdiction over fishing regulations within  
5 national marine sanctuaries. Currently this discussion  
6 and debate is playing out in the Channel Islands in  
7 California as well as in the Northwestern Hawaiian  
8 Islands proposed sanctuaries.

9           As it currently stands under law, the  
10 sanctuary program has precedence over the management  
11 within sanctuaries, if that that makes sense, but is  
12 required to work with the National Marine Fishery  
13 Service and the Councils to come up with fishing  
14 regulations that are compatible to the goals and  
15 objectives of the public sanctuary.

16           NOAA has signaled that any conflicts between  
17 the two branches of NOAA over what is compatible and  
18 what is not will be worked out on a case-by-case basis.  
19 They are doing this in the Channel Islands right now  
20 and also in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands.

21           The kicker in this debate that has just  
22 appeared recently is that Congress is getting involved.



1 The Mannis & Stevenson Act is being reauthorized. And  
2 one version of the Bill in the House that has been  
3 introduced by Representative Combo from California  
4 would reverse this precedent and give Mannis, NMFS and  
5 the Councils precedence in deciding fisheries  
6 management within the sanctuaries.

7           Regardless of what your view on this might be,  
8 I wanted to bring it to the attention of the Committee  
9 because I think it could have profound implications for  
10 how sanctuaries and potentially other Marine Protected  
11 Areas would be managed in the future compared to how  
12 many would be managed now under current law.

13           CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thanks. Any comments?  
14 It's just an informational item. Thanks, Dennis.

15           DR. HEINEMANN: Sure.

16           CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Brian, do you want to say a  
17 thing or two?

18           MR. MELZIAN: Thank you. I want to illustrate  
19 a couple of documents that perhaps you folks should be  
20 aware of.

21           There are two major activities that are now  
22 underway. In relation to the U.S. Ocean Action Plan,

1 these activities are moving as a train down the track  
2 and perhaps the Marine Protected Areas Federal Advisory  
3 Committee should at least be aware of them, especially  
4 how it relates to monitoring the assessments of the  
5 MPAs in the future.

6 I am going to talk about two of them  
7 briefly -- and I'm not ranking them. One of them is  
8 the development of the National Waterfall Monitoring  
9 Network in the U.S. coastal waters and their  
10 tributaries. This monitoring network was recommended  
11 in the U.S. Ocean Action Plan and consists of EPA,  
12 NOAA, USDS and other Federal Agencies and there were 80  
13 folks working during the last year to develop this  
14 monitoring plan for 149 estuaries, major tributaries,  
15 great rivers, also the Territorial Sea, three miles,  
16 and to the Exclusive Economic Zone which is 200  
17 nautical miles.

18 That draft monitoring document, as required in  
19 the Action Plan, was submitted to CEQ, the President's  
20 Council on Environmental Quality, this month. We are  
21 hoping that this will eventually be going out for  
22 public review.

1           So, why I bring this in is that MPAs for the  
2   Great Lakes, Territorial Waters and the Federal Waters  
3   would perhaps be part of this network sometime in the  
4   future.

5           Lauren forwarded to you the hot link. I have  
6   a little poster that is going to be presented at the  
7   National Meeting at San Jose next week which briefly  
8   describes it.

9           The second topic, which you heard me talk  
10   about before and I won't go into detail, is the  
11   Integrated Ocean Observing System. Tomorrow I will  
12   leave out on the table the first development plan, and  
13   there is a second development plan being finalized as I  
14   speak. If you want to, just look at it. If you want  
15   to get a copy, let me know and I will ask our Ocean.US  
16   office folks to send it to you.

17           This is the system that is going to be  
18   monitoring an area as large as the Continental United  
19   States when you look at the Exclusive Economic Zone,  
20   Hawaiian Islands, Alaska, et cetera.

21           And then, lastly, this is a fairly new  
22   newsletter. Because similar to the recommendation to

1 get the word out about MPAs and what we are doing here,  
2 IOOS is finally getting its act together with a very  
3 nice newsletter which is posted on the Ocean.US web  
4 site.

5 I will just leave copies of this out on the  
6 table tomorrow and if you want to review this  
7 newsletter, you are more than welcome to do so. Thank  
8 you.

9 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: Thank you, Brian, very  
10 much.

11 Okay. What else? You want to quit early  
12 today or would you like to stay?

13 Yeah. Right. That is my attempt at humor. I  
14 get your point.

15 Lauren, would you like to tell us how we  
16 should -- How do you want to organize the dinner  
17 tonight?

18 MS. WENZEL: Our reservation, to remind  
19 people, is at the Water Street Seafood Company at 6:30  
20 and that is located at 309 North Water Street. It is  
21 about half a mile from the hotel.

22 So, what I was going to suggest is that we

1 meet in the lobby of the Bayfront Hotel at 6:15 and  
2 walk over. If anyone wants to come from a different  
3 direction or go out beforehand, just meet us there at  
4 309 North Water Street.

5 CHAIRMAN BROMLEY: So, 6:15 in the lobby of  
6 the other hotel.

7 And hearing no objections, I think we are in  
8 recess until 8:00 in the morning. Is that right?

9 Subcommittees will come ready to report. You  
10 have 30 minutes each. We expect to have a wonderful  
11 start.

12 (Proceedings recessed at 4:26 p.m.)  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

STATE OF TEXAS \*

COUNTY OF NUECES \*

I, CONNIE S. CALVERT, Certified Shorthand Reporter #1867 for the State of Texas, Registered Professional Reporter, Federally Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the Western District of Texas, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing contains a true and correct transcription of the proceedings, to the best of my ability, in the above-styled cause, all of which occurred in open forum and were reported by me.

I further certify that the total cost for the preparation of this Reporter's Record is \_\_\_\_\_ and was paid/will be paid by \_\_\_\_\_.

WITNESS MY OFFICIAL HAND on this 7TH DAY OF MAY, A.D., 2006.

\_\_\_\_\_  
CONNIE S. CALVERT

CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER #1867 (TEXAS)

EXPIRATION DATE 12-31-07

FEDERALLY CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS